DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 072 127 UD 013 148

AUTHOR	Longo, Paul; Auerbach, Carl
TITLE	An Evaluation of the State Urban Education Programs, Community School District 1, New York City Board of Education. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Teaching and Learning Research Corp., New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y.
PUB DATE	Jul 72
NOTE	74p.; Function Nos. 33-2-6453, 6455 and 6456
EDRS PRICE	MF-$.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Compensatory Education Programs; Disadvantaged Youth; Economically Disadvantaged; Elementary Education; Master Teachers; Paraprofessional School Personnel; Programed Instruction; *Program Evaluation; *Reading Programs; Secondary Education; Student Teachers; *Teacher Aides; *Teacher Education; Teacher Morale
IDENTIFIERS	New York City

ABSTRACT

This report evaluates three New York City school district educational projects funded by the "New York State Urban Education Program" enacted at the 1969 legislative session of the New York State Legislature for the purpose of "meeting special educational needs associated with poverty." Project Read represents an attempt to improve the reading ability of children in one school, P. S. 140 M in District 1, through the use of programmed reading materials that put particular stress on the acquisition of skills in phonics. An additional objectives was to raise both the morale and the willingness to experiment of participating teachers. The STINT (Supportive Training for Inexperienced and New Teachers) Program represents an attempt to support and train new or inexperienced teachers in eight selected schools in District 1, on the lower East Side of Manhattan. The program included eight master teachers, each of whom was responsible for approximately 10 trainees. The Upper Grade Elementary School Educational Assistants Program involves 23 educational assistants assigned to grades three through six in 12 schools of District 1. The program objectives are divided into three parts: parent-school contact, individualization of instruction, and reading performance. (Author/JM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Function Nos. 33-26-455
33-26-456
33-26-453

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 072127

FINAL REPORT

AN EVALUATION

OF THE

STATE URBAN EDUCATION PROGRAMS

COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT 1

NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION

PROJECT READ

SUPPORTIVE TRAINING FOR INEXPERIENCED AND NEW TEACHERS

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANTS GRADES 3-6

JULY 1972

An evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded by the "New York State Urban Education Program" enacted at the 1969 legislative session of the New York State Legislature for the purpose of "meeting special educational needs associated with poverty". (Chapter 685, Section 9, subdivision 11, laws of 1969, performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1971-72 school year.)

TEACHING & LEARNING
RESEARCH CORP.

UD 013148

91-31 Queens Boulevard/Suite 611/Elmhurst, New York 11373/212-478-4340

EVALUATION STAFF

PROJECT READ

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: PAUL LONGO ED.D.

SUPPORTIVE TRAINING FOR INEXPERIENCED AND NEW TEACHERS

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: PAUL LONGO ED.D.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANTS GRADES 3-6

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: CARL AUERBACH PH.D.

RESEARCH ASSOCIATE: PATRICIA DUTMERS

RESEARCH ASSISTANTS: JAMES LEWANDOWSKI
JEANETTE TAGGART
LAWRENCE TAYLOR

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The information in this study could not have been compiled without the cooperation of many District 1 personnel. Special appreciation is extended to Flora Belle Zaluskin, STINT Project Director; Mrs. Claire Buschel, Project Read Director; Mr. Margolis, principal of P.S. 140; Mrs. Frances Kirschner, Coordinator of the Auxiliary Educational Career Unit; Mrs. Gwendolyn Gilbert and Mrs. Daisy Montanez, two auxiliary trainers, and to their respective staffs.

The gratitude of the evaluation staff is also extended to all the teachers, trainers, paraprofessionals and children participating in the projects who gave of their time and effort and who assisted in compiling the evaluation data.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Table of Contents	i
List of Tables	ii
Executive Summary	
Project Read	iii
Suppportive Training for Inexperienced and New Teachers	iv
Elementary School Educational Assistants Grades 3-6	vi
Project Read	
Background	1
Program Description	2
Evaluation Design	3
Findings	4
Recommendations	11
Appendix A: Teachers' Questionnaire Results	13
Appendix B: Non Project Read Teacher Questionnaire Results	15
Appendix C: Results of the Analysis of Questionnaire Items 4-25	16
Appendix D: Project Read Teachers Questionnaire	17
Supportive Training for Inexperienced and New Teachers	
Background	20
Program Description	21
Evaluation Design	22
Findings	24
Problems of Data Collection	37
Recommendations	38
Conclusion	40
Appendix A: A Compilation of Teacher Responses Regarding Strengths and Weaknesses of the STINT Program	41
Appendix B: A Compilation of Recommendations and Suggestions in Regard to the STINT Program	42
Appendix C: Teacher Questionnaire	43
Elementary School Educational Assistants Grades 3-6	
Program Description	48
Evaluation Instruments and Evaluation Data	49
Evaluation Results	50
Summary	52
Conclusions and Recommendations	52
Appendix A: List of Upper Grade Educational Assistants and Teachers by School	57
Appendix B: Teacher Questionnaire	58
Appendix C: Administration Questionnaire	59
Appendix D: Educational Assistant Questionnaire	60
Appendix E: Parent Questionnaire	61
Appendix F: Reading Instruction Observational Scheme	63

LIST OF TABLES

Project Read — Page

I. Results of Anticipated Versus Real Analysis of Reading Scores 7
II. A Compilation of Teacher Responses Regarding Strengths and Weaknesses of the Project Read Program 10

Supportive Training for Inexperienced and New Teachers

I. Results of the Anticipated Versus Real Analysis of Reading Scores for Pupils in STINT Classrooms 30
II. STINT and Non-STINT Reading Scores for Second Grades Within the Same School 31
III. Analysis of Trainees Evaluation of Their Own Teaching Performance 33
IV. Analysis of Questonnaire Items Dealing with Attitudes of Trainees Toward Teaching 33
V. Results of the Trainees' Evaluation of Trainers Presented by Item 34
VI. Results of Teacher Response to Item Eight of the Questionnaire Given by Percent 34
VII. Results of Teacher Response to Item Nine of the Questionnaire Given by Percentage 35
VIII. Results of Teacher Response to Item Ten Given by Percentage 35
IX. Results of Teacher Response to Item Eleven Given by Percentage 35
X. A Comparison of the Turnover Rate of STINT Trainees to 1970-71 Rates for New York City Schools as a Whole 36

Elementary School Educational Assistants Grades 3-6

1. Summary of Parent Questionnaire. Percentage of Yes, No and Don't Know Responses to each of the 4 Questions 54
2. Summary of Educational Assistant Questionnaire. Percentage of Never, Sometimes and Frequently Response to each of the Questions 55
3. Summary of Teacher Questionnaire. Percentage of None, Sometimes and Frequently Responses to each of the Questions 55
4. Summary of Classroom Observation. Percentage of Time Spent by Teachers in each Observational Category 56

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Project Read represents an attempt to improve the reading ability of children in one school, P.S. 140 M in District 1, through the use of programmed reading materials that put particular stress on the acquisition of skills in phonics.

The objectives of the program were as follows:

1. Upon conclusion of the program the children who used the Sullivan Programmed Materials will show greater improvement in reading as demonstrated by standardized tests than children of comparable ability levels who did not use such materials.

2. Upon conclusion of the program, the participating teachers will exhibit higher morale and be more willing to experiment than teachers who have been confined to the traditional approach.

Analysis of Metropolitan Reading Test scores and questionnaires designed to measure teacher attitudes led to the following results:

1. There was not a significant improvement in the overall reading scores of the children involved in the Project Read Program.

2. Comparisons of control and experimental groups in regard to teacher morale and willingness to experiment proved inconclusive. There was no noticeable difference between the two groups and no significant change within the experimental group on questionnaires administered on a pre and post basis.

On the basis of direct observation of the program as well as the results of the data mentioned above, the following recommendations were made:

1. That the goals of the program be clarified in regard to what specific aspects of reading improvement could be expected and that the appropriate instrument be selected for measuring these goals.

2. That the Sullivan Materials be heavily supplemented by a variety of other materials that stress reading comprehension and that much more time be devoted to developing that particular skill.

3. That kindergarten and first grade classes employ a greater variety of reading materials and that large group instruction based on the Sullivan charts be modified and supplemented with additional activities.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The STINT Program represents an attempt to support and train new or inexperienced teachers in eight selected schools in District 1, on the lower east side of Manhattan. The program included eight master teachers, each of whom was responsible for approximately ten trainees.

The objectives of the program were as follows:

1. Upon conclusion of the program, the children in the demonstration classes taught by the master teachers will show greater improvement in reading than the children did last year as measured by standardized tests.

2. The teacher trainees who work with a master teacher for one-half day will show improvement in teacher strategies and techniques.

3. The turnover among new teachers who participate in the program will be less than the turnover of such teachers in comparable districts.

Analysis of Metropolitan Reading Test scores, teacher turnover rates and a questionnaire designed to record changes in teaching strategy led to the following results:

1. A comparison of pre and post program reading scores showed there were significant differences in two of seven schools involved in the project. There was not enough reading data for an appropriate analysis to be done in the eighth school.

2. There was no significant change in the teaching strategies and techniques employed by STINT trainees as measured by a questionnaire administered on a pre and post program basis.

3. Since no data was available on attrition rates for new teachers for either District 1 or comparable districts, no authoritative analysis was attempted at this time.

On the basis of direct observation of the program as well as the results of the data mentioned above, the following recommendations were made:

1. That the role of the trainer be more clearly defined and the job responsibilities for which he or she will be held accountable, specified.

2. That trainers organize their programs more thoroughly and initiate their activities with trainees earlier in the school year when the inexperienced teacher has a pressing need for their services.

3. That the selection of both the schools and the trainees that will be serviced by a master teacher be done more judiciously, with specific attention given to both needs and the type of help that can be provided.

4. That the role of the Project Director be expanded and trainers made more responsible to that person.

5. That the one-half day of demonstration lessons be abandoned as impractical and a more flexible arrangement made in its place.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Upper Grade Elementary School Educational Assistants Program involves 23 educational assistants assigned to grades three through six in 12 schools of District 1.

The program objectives are divided into three parts; parent-school contact, individualization of instruction, and reading performance.

The evaluation objectives were to see how well the above program objectives are being met.

Evaluation instruments included four questionnaires (Administration, Teacher's, Educational Assistants' and Parents'), direct observation of reading instruction with an educational assistant, and analysis of reading scores on the Metropolitan Achievement Test.

The results of this evaluation are:

1) The presence of the educational assistants was reported, by all concerned, to increase parent involvement with the school.

2) The presence of the educational assistants was reported by the teachers to permit them to individualize instruction, and classroom observation supported this claim.

3) The presence of educational assistants did not apparently improve the rate of growth on the Metropolitan Achievement Test for the students involved.

As the program seems satisfactory to all concerned, it is recommended that it be continued. Perhaps the expectation that this kind of educational intervention will have a significant effect on reading performance is unwarranted. Certainly the lack of increase in achievement cannot be attributed to the educational assistants as they are performing the job they were trained to do. However, in order to maximize the chance of improving reading performance it is recommended that increased attention be given to this problem in their training. However, the educational assistants are clearly not primarily responsible for the quality of reading instruction - this is an issue to which all the schools in the district should give some attention.

Function No. 33-26-455

PROJECT READ

Background

The program was jointly planned by the Community Superintendent and the School Board of District #1, located on the lower east side of Manhattan. The project involved twenty one teachers and fifteen paraprofessionals in one school of that district, P.S. 140. Of 21 classes that participated in the project, eighteen were composed of children in grades K-4. The additional three classes consisted of two fifth grades and one sixth grade. The children in these 21 classes were taught reading through the use of the Sullivan reading materials.

The Sullivan Program is relatively well known within the field of education. Several other districts within New York City are apparently using the materials and their distribution is, of course, nationwide. While many teachers are not familiar with the specific materials, the use of programmed learning aides is generally widespread and most would understand the concept involved. Even within schools which do not use the materials, there is much interest in the result of research with them.

The parent organization, Behavioral Research Laboratory, which produces and distributes the materials, has engaged in several interesting projects which have been widely publicized by the press. The most notable of these has probably been the initiation of the concept of performance contracting in which a profit-making organization such as BRL assumes responsibility for the education of children in a particular school or schools. Payment for services is predicated upon the capacity of the organization to bring children's achievement levels up to a predetermined level of performance. BRL has recently completed the second year of such a contract in a large number of schools in Gary, Indiana. The Sullivan Materials were used there and considerable success was reported after the first year data had been analyzed. Since the program was conducted in inner city schools with children in need of reading remediation, there has been close and continued interest in the results obtained there and in similar programs elsewhere.

The Sullivan Program is based upon the use of programmed workbooks which stress reading skills and are graded for difficulty. The workbooks allow children to progress at their own rate and are thus well suited to individualizing instruction. Children involved in the program are initially screened to determine their level of reading skill. Once this reading level has been determined, each child is assigned the appropriate workbook. While children using a traditional basal reading series are generally confined to perhaps three levels within the normal classroom, the Sullivan Program allows a much broader variation in the level of reading skills taught. Rather than being confined to one of three workbooks, the teacher has the opportunity to assign the student work in well over a dozen, depending upon the level of skills the child has attained.

The student progresses through the workbook under the guidance of the teacher. At certain predetermined points, the child's work is checked to see if he or she is progressing satisfactorily. This is done on an individual basis and the student may not continue until the teacher has determined that the work has been done appropriately and the skills understood. Phonics is heavily stressed throughout the program. Indeed, the initial set of workbooks is devoted almost exclusively to developing particular sets of phonic skills that are considered necessary to successful reading at later levels. When a child completes a workbook, he moves on to the next level of difficulty.

The capacity to determine their own pace and the desire to move on to higher levels is often an incentive for students who have experienced difficulty in keeping up with their peers.

The skills developed in the workbook are used in a series of comprehension readers. The readers are also graded for difficulty and are used in conjunction with specific workbooks. When a child has completed a workbook, the readers are available for his use. The books are generally simply illustrated and the children may read them individually or in groups with their teacher. In Project Read, the general practice was for children to read one of the books with the teacher and the remaining books in the set by themselves. There is, of course, no barrier to the use of additional reading materials to enhance comprehension skills save time.

At lower grade levels (kindergarten or first grade), books containing large charts are used. Teachers are directed to ask specific quesions about letters, symbols or pictorial representations that appear on the chart. These are again directed toward the development of particular reading skills such as left to right eye movement or the recognition of letters. Teachers at all levels are provided with instructor manuals which explain the use of the materials and offer additional suggested activities. BRL also provides representatives who visit the schools, observe teachers and offer advice or aid.

Program Description

The intent of Project Read was to see if the daily use of the Sullivan materials by students would result in their making greater average gains in reading than students who did not use them. A further aim was that classroom teachers, involved in the project, would exhibit higher morale and a greater willingness to experiment than teachers confined to more traditional methods.

A brief abstract of the original proposal summarizes its intent. "This program operating on a pilot basis in one district school (P.S. 140M) will make use of the Sullivan program material as the main vehicle of teaching children who are retarded in reading. The program will operate under the direction of the school's Corrective Reading Teacher (CRT), and consultants from the Behavioral Research Laboratories (BRL)- the institution providing the materials- will be part of the in-service training effort. The progress of the children will be noted to assess the efficacy of this approach."

The proposal indicated that the C.R.T. had had two years of experience with the program and would be responsible for orienting new teachers in the proper use of the materials. Some of the teachers in the program who had also had previous experience with the Sullivan Materials were to be used in a "buddy" system that would help support new teachers and familiarize them with some of the techniques that had proven useful. Educational assistants (paraprofessionals) were to be used to "receive, classify and help distrubute materials at the direction of the CRT."

After the initial orientation at the beginning of the year by the CRT, District Reading Coordinator and consultant from BRL, the teachers were to conduct the program for two hours daily in the morning from 9 to 11 A.M. Approximately 620 pupils in grades K-4 were to be involved.

Evaluation Design

The evaluation program drawn up by the Teaching & Learning Research Corporation was designed to test two major objectives of the program. The first of these concerned the reading progress that children in the program had made. This would be done by comparing pre and post program performance on a standardized reading test. The original intention had been to compare the average rate of gain during the year the program was in progress with the average rate of gain that students had attained during their previous years in school. If the average grade equivalent during the first three years was 2.1, then anything above a .7 grade equivalent would have been considered an indication of the effectiveness of the program.

Two difficulties made the use of this type of analysis impossible. The first was the fact that children in kindergarten, first and second grades would not have had a set of prior scores available. Children in kindergarten and first grade are not tested in the New York City schools and scores for the second grades would only be available at the end of the year. Since the Project Read Program (with the exception of three classes) is concentrated almost exclusively in grade levels K-4, there would not have been enough data available on the prior performance of students to justify the type of analysis initially suggested.

The second difficulty was that complete sets of reading scores did not exist for many of the children in the program. The student population is relatively mobile and children new to the school would not have had a prior set of reading scores. In addition, students who were absent on one or all of the days that the reading tests were given would also have lacked a reading score for a particular year or years.

Faced with this dilemma, the comparison of average gain over a three year period was abandoned. In its place, an alternative procedure involving the use of an anticipated versus a real design was employed. In this procedure the growth that would have been anticipated, based on the evaluation of prior achievement, is compared to the actual growth that takes place. Each child thus becomes his own control and his progress can be compared to his own previous achievement the prior year. Unexpected growth, beyond that which could have normally been expected, would then be attributed to the impact of the program.

The second major goal of the Project Read Program was to effect an attitude change in teachers in regard to morale and willingness to experiment. The hope was that involvement in the program would result in increased satisfaction with teaching and thus improve morale. Similarly, it was hoped that the experimental aspects of the program would cause teachers to become more open to innovations and new techniques in regard to teaching methodology or the use of a variety of different materials.

In order to evaluate teacher morale and changes in attitude toward experimentation, a questionnaire was constructed. The questionnaire was designed to investigate overall morale and the willingness to try new methods and techniques. This was administered on a pre and post basis. A content analysis was made of items 1-4, which asks teachers to evaluate strengths and weaknesses of the program. This information is reported in Table II. For items 4-9, the scores were summed and a correlated t-test was used to compare pre and post attitudes. For questions 10-25, each of the items was summed and compared separately with a correlated t-test being used to compare pre and post scores.

A third objective of the evaluation was to determine if the program had been implemented according the District 1 proposal. This was to be accomplished by monthly visits to the school to observe the use of the Sullivan Materials and to assess whether all materials were available and whether teachers had been adequately trained in their use.

Findings

The Program in Operation

Monthly visits were made to the school as indicated in the evaluation design. These visits consisted of talks with the project director (Mrs. Claire Buschel), interviews with teachers and visits to classrooms in which Project Read was being conducted. Interviews were also held with several of the educational assistants involved in the project.

The program in operation was very close to the original design. Grades K-3 devoted at least the first hour of each day to formally organized work in reading. Most classes that were visited had three different groups working. Invariably each of the groups was actively engaged. Generally one group met with the teacher, another with the paraprofessional and the third group was either given board work adapted from the Sullivan materials or continued on their own in the programmed readers and workbooks.

The planning and organization of the program in the classrooms appeared to be very sound. The vast majority of the children seemed to be profitably engaged. The board work reflected both thought and preparation. In addition, for those children who completed their work early, most rooms provided ample opportunity for reading related activities based on the Sullivan materials. Children seemed to enjoy the games, many of which were quite useful in reinforcing prior learnings. Apparently the school was visited monthly by a Sullivan representative. Besides visiting classes and making suggestions about classroom organization and teaching practices, the representative sometimes conducted sessions with the teachers in which supplemental activities, including some of the games that were observed, were discussed. The project director and most of the teachers appeared to feel these visits were quite useful, particularly when the program was first being organized.

On one occasion I visited several of the classrooms with the Sullivan representative. In most cases she had something specific to contribute to the teacher and in a few instances she checked on suggestions that had apparently been made on a prior visit to see if the ideas had been implemented. The rapport with teachers was good and the conversations seemed candid and useful.

The use of paraprofessionals is well organized and quite extensive. They have distinct tasks, their responsibilities seemed to be clear to them and their rapport with the teachers was generally rather good. They worked well with the children and displayed an understanding of the program. There were exceptions but, in general, the staff utilization of paraprofessional help appeared to be excellent and the assistants themselves seemed to be doing a good job.

Reading in grades K-3 was generally over by 10 AM, although it was not unusual for some classrooms to continue until 10:30. Although this did not exactly meet the time allotment suggested in the original proposal, it is unlikely that reading could have been profitably pursued and interest maintained for much longer. It should be pointed out that in some classes, though the

formal reading period ended, children used materials related to the project in informal activities at various times during the school day.

There was unquestionably much time spent on the reading program. The teachers appeared dedicated and were,almost without exception, enthusiastic about the program. There were some complaints from teachers that the program focused on phonics at the expense of comprehension. Not all felt this way or agreed with the criticism but it was voiced frequently enough, on questionnaires and in personal interviews, to indicate that it could be a serious problem.

Beyond this, teachers clearly felt that children were enjoying and profiting from the program. This view was supported by the amount of time and effort that was put into the reading effort. It was rare for me to make a visit and find a class that was not engaged in reading at the stipulated time. Interaction among teachers appeared to be very good and there appeared to be a great deal of sharing of ideas and materials.

At 10:00 A.M., the paraprofessionals moved from the primary grades to those intermediate classes (4-6) that are engaged in the program. The structure in these classrooms was very similar to that described in the primary grades. Again, the classroom organization was effective and there was broad exposure to the various elements of the Sullivan program. With the exception of the one complaint already noted, teachers at these grade levels also appeared enthusiastic and optimistic about their pupils' reading progress.

In summary, the mechanics of the program appeared to operate quite well. The necessary materials were available and the teachers appeared to make appropriate use of them. The teachers, with a few notable exceptions, seemed highly motivated. The project director appeared to provide excellent leadership. Her office was frequently the center of informal discussions about various aspects of the project. Not only ideas, but materials were coordinated, stored and exchanged in her office as well. She appears to have gotten the program organized and operating with very little teacher resentment, an accomplishment of major import for the possible success of the program. Overall, there was good planning, effort and leadership. The teachers appeared competent and there was a great deal of optimism about what was being accomplished.

Results of the Interviews

The vast majority of the teachers interviewed demonstrated unabashed enthusiasm for the Project Read Program. While there were individual complaints about class size or the inability to spend enough time with individual pupils, most teachers felt that the materials they were using were superior to those they had employed in the past. The beneficial aspects of having students progress at their own pace was frequently mentioned. Most teachers also felt strongly about the need to develop phonic skills. This was often pointed to as one of the singular strengths of the Sullivan Materials.

One teacher pointed out that her reading program was, in effect, conducted along the lines of an open classroom. Children were working individually at well defined tasks and she hoped to expand this teaching procedure to other areas. Several others mentioned the relative informality of the classroom during reading and pointed out that children were developing improved work habits and a greater capacity for self-direction.

As has been mentioned, there were criticisms of the lack of adequate reading comprehension materials. Some seemed to feel that they were adequately compensating for this lack by employing other available reading materials. Others felt they did not have the time to plan for and select the wide variety of additional materials necessary and appropriate for their students' individual tastes or needs. It should be made clear that this complaint was not voiced by all. One could roughly chart the increase of concern as the grade levels went higher.

Interviews with paraprofessionals yielded a great deal of personnel satisfaction. Most expressed uncritical approval of the program and appeared to feel they were able to make more of a contribution as a result of the way materials were used and the manner in which the program was organized. While a few appeared to have some difficulty with discipline, the vast majority expressed optimism about the way the program was functioning. Their morale seemed high and there were no complaints voiced in regard to their relationships with teachers or the way in which they were used in the program.

It should also be noted that the tenor of interviews with a limited number of non-Read teachers did not differ substantially in regard to attitudes about what was being accomplished in their reading programs. While some felt they did not have the advantage of the additional materials provided for Project Read personnel, they still seemed to feel that good reading progress was being made by their pupils. This may reflect a generally strong reading program in P.S. 140 or a congenital optimism on the part of teachers about what is being accomplished under their direction.

Results of the Analysis of Reading Scores

Scores attained on the reading section of the Metropolitan Achievement Test were used as a means of measuring the progress that students in Project Read had made. The test is administered in April or May of each school year. Thus student scores prior to and at the conclusion of the program could be compared. The sample population consisted of all students involved in the program with the exception of kindergarten and first grade classes, which are not tested.*

For the purpose of analysis, a statistical treatment was employed in which a student's expected growth in reading was compared to the actual growth that took place as measured by the reading test scores. In this method, the percentage reading growth that might normally be expected for a year was computed for those students involved in the program. The expected mean score, based on the 1971 scores, was 2.97. The actual mean score of the students at the conclusion of the program was an identical 2.97. The indication is that the scores that were achieved could have reasonably been expected and that Project Read did not result in a substantial or significant increase in these scores. There was no measurable difference over and above what might have been anticipated had the students continued to progress at the same pace that they had over the past year.

---

* Excluded, of necessity, were those students for whom a prior test score was not available. Data on the two fifth grades and the one sixth that had been added to the program were not available at the time this report was written.

In fairness to the program, several things should be noted at this point. It is possible, as the project director pointed out, that the Metropolitan Reading Tests do not measure adequately what the program is designed to accomplish. The Sullivan Materials, particularly in the lower grades, stress phonics rather heavily. This was considered especially important and beneficial in a school where, for many of the students, English is a second language. It is also possible that the results of such a program can only be fairly measured over a lengthier period, when the phonic base begins to result in improved reading comprehension. In addition, it should be realized that reading growth did take place. The pre-project mean reading score for the students in the program was 2.26 and the mean score at the conclusion of the year was 2.97. This represents slightly less than a year's growth and should not be ignored. Given the difficulty of measuring the nuances of reading growth accurately, it would be foolish to ignore the real gains that were made.

In regard to expected growth, one can reasonably argue that growth does not always proceed regularly. Progress is often uneven and students frequently reach plateaus where skills are sorted and assimilated before further progress takes place. It should also be noted that the reading achievement level of those with reading disabilities or deficiencies often move further away from national norms as the student progresses upward through the grades. Due to either lowered confidence or lack of incentive in an area of acknowledged weakness, such students often lose ground in relation to national norms rather than closing the gap. At some point, this spiral of increased difference must be stemmed and a program can successfully accomplish this without necessarily demonstrating statistically significant differences for the pupils involved. We are dealing in an area of great complexity and one must admit candidly that it is not always possible to determine with precision the amount of success or failure for which a program is responsible. Having said all this, one must return to the original intent of the program. It was planned and funded in the belief that some visible progress in reading achievement levels would ensue as a result of the particular materials chosen and the manner in which they would be used. The unsettling fact remains that no measurable reading progress that could be attributed to the program has resulted. The results of the analysis are included in Table I below.

Table I

Results of the Anticipated Versus Real

Analysis of Reading Scores

	Mean Grade Eq.	S.D.	t
1971	2.26	0.53	
Anticipated 1972	2.97	0.66	0.04
Real 1972	2.97	0.81	

not significant at the .05 level

One possible note of further interest might be mentioned. The mean reading scores of grade levels 2-4 at P.S. 140 were compared to similar mean scores for classes at these levels throughout the district. These are the only grades for which scores are available. At grade level two, P.S. 140 has a mean score that is below 80% of the other second grade classes in the district. At grade level three, the mean score for P.S. 140 is below only 40% of the district's classes and at grade level four, it rises above 80% of the scores in the other schools. While this is not statistically significant, since we are speaking of three different populations, the pattern is an interesting one and should be observed more closely in the future. The difference between being 80% below all scores for the second grades in the district and 80% above all scores for fourth grades is a dramatic one. There is no clear explanation for such a radical imbalance over three grade levels. It is tempting, though statistically unjustified, to speculate over the possible impact that an increase in phonic skills could have on reading scores at higher grade levels. More time and a continuation of this imbalance would be necessary before any valid conclusions could be drawn, however.

Results of the Questionnaire

The results of the questionnaires dealing with teacher morale and willingness to experiment were inconclusive. There were several reasons for this. The largest part of the Project Read program was concentrated in grades K-4 (18 of the 21 classes involved). This constituted 90% of the teaching faculty at those grade levels and thus the remaining control group was very small. Indeed, seventy-five percent of the total teaching faculty of the school was involved in the program. The small size of the control sample, in both absolute terms and the number of completed questionnaires returned, made any accurate comparison of Read and non-Read faculty impossible. Comparisons were made of the pre and post attitudes of those teachers who were in the Read program.

The questionnaire was designed with the results of previous research on morale in mind. Three broadly defined areas relating to teacher morale were identified. These included measures of satisfaction with fellow employees, with the specific teaching assignment and with teaching as a career.

The results that were obtained tended to indicate no significant difference between pre and post scores on the part of those involved in Project Read. An analysis of the data in questionnaire items 10-25 produced a significant difference on only one question. This question dealt with the teacher's belief that her students would be adequately prepared to do the grade level work expected of them next year. Here there was a significant and positive increase in the percentage of students that teachers believed would be better prepared. Though it is the only item in which significant difference occurred, it is an interesting and perhaps important one in terms of teacher attitude.

The difference between pre and post scores on items 4-9 approached significance. While no clear statement can be made in regard to these results, they did indicate a tendency for teacher attitudes to move in the direction of increased job satisfaction. This data is presented in Appendix C.

As has been indicated, the results of expressed teacher willingness to experiment were also inconclusive. Both groups indicated an equal willingness

to suggest new ideas or approaches. Such ideas were confined largely to adjustments within the confines of the accepted classroom structure or suggestions about added services for that classroom. This was true of teachers in both the control and experimental groups. Little difference was noted either between or within groups in the pre and post questionnaires. Similarly, interviews with Project Read teachers held at intervals during the school year evidenced little change in teacher attitudes toward experimentation. The teachers seemed highly motivated at the beginning and this attitude seemed to remain constant during the year. A breakdown of teacher suggestions and comments is included in Table II. (See next page.)

It is, of course, impossible to apply any meaningful statistical treatment to the comments listed in Table II. The comments are mainly useful for those either administering or teaching in the Project Read Program. They do provide some notes of more general interest, however. It is clear that teachers in the program see individualization as one of its main strengths. This comment placed highly on both the pre and post program lists.

It is also interesting to note that teachers seemed to feel more strongly about the positive influence of the emphasis on phonics at the conclusion of the year than at the beginning. Similarly, the fact that a child is able to see his own progress was not even mentioned specifically in the Fall of 1971 and yet received a considerable amount of attention at the end of the year.

The comments about the weaknesses of the program in regard to reading comprehension remained relatively constant on both the pre and post questionnaires. This was an item that was frequently mentioned in interviews with teachers and its appearance on both of the questionnaires is not particularly surprising.

Teacher suggestions for the improvement of the Project Read Program are included in Appendix A. Comments on both the pre and post questionnaires are included. Similarly, comments by non-Read teachers as to strengths, weaknesses and recommendations about their programs are included in Appendix B.

Table II

A Compilation of Teacher Responses Regarding Strengths and Weaknesses of the Project Read Program

	Fall 1971		Spring 1972	
	Comments	Number Responding	Comments	Number Responding
strengths	Individualization of placement and speed of work	7	Phonics and work attack skills	9
	Programmed materials reinforced learning	4	Individualized approach	6
	Strong on phonics	3	Child can see his own progress	6
	Reading materials are interesting	2	Helps younger children grasp concepts related to reading	2
	Administration and staff are interested and cooperative	2		
weaknesses	Not enough emphasis on comprehension, stories uninteresting	6	Unfamiliar vocabulary used in text and lack of comprehension work	7
	Lack of sufficient time for each student	3	Dependence upon pictures for work clues	4
	Discipline problems	2	Children can guess answers without thinking through questions	2
	Too many students in class	2	Lack of time, class size	2

Recommendations

As must be obvious from the previous text of this report, the results do not lend themselves easily to simple or direct recommendations. If one is to evaluate the program on the basis of its original intent as stated in the proposal, it simply did not achieve the hoped for results in the critical area of reading achievement. To use this as the sole basis of evaluation, however, one must ignore the attitudes of teachers involved in the project. The program has apparently provided them with a clear, well organized approach to teaching reading that they feel is highly useful. They seem to have an optimistic attitude and this must affect the kind of concentrated effort that was readily apparent in most classrooms. The teachers are not uncritical in regard to the materials they use. Many have pointed out that the Sullivan Materials are weak in comprehension skills and this has been a major concern of the evaluator since the initial visits to the school. Still, the teachers clearly feel that what the program does provide in terms of phonic skills and allowing individual children to progress at their own rate, is important and should not be lost (See Table II).

In the balance, the evaluator would recommend that the program be continued, with the clear stipulation that its goals be stated in measurable terms and that the future of the program be decided by the achievement of those goals. It is not only possible, but likely, that a reading program will not show evidence of progress within a one year span. It is far too complex a skill. On the other hand, an expensive program can not be continued indefinitely without some indication that it is making a difference for the children involved.

There is clearly a need for far more extensive use of reading comprehension materials. As has been noted, the Sullivan Program appears very weak in this regard and this weakness has been widely noted by teachers. One is left with the impression that everyting is preparation for reading but there is too little actual reading going on. It is possible that much of the joy and pleasure of reading will be muted by an overemphasis on skills at the expense of comprehension. If students either cannot or will not read, it is likely that the phonic skills so assiduously developed will soon atrophy. If BRL does not expand the comprehension aspects of its program, Project Read teachers must determine to heavily supplement their efforts with other reading materials that will hopefully accomplish what BRL has not provided.

At lower grade levels, particularly kindergarten, there is a similar need for a greater variety of materials. There is a lot of whole group instruction in tightly structured situations that seem to conflict with the organization of the program. If there were a greater variety of materials available at this level it would help to decentralize the teaching. While the materials are clearly helpful in a variety of ways, their use contributes to lessons that can be tedious, lengthy and overly directive.

In summary, the program appears to have obvious merits despite the lack of statistically significant results in reading achievement progress for the 1971-72 school year. It would appear to be exceedingly wasteful to deny the possible promise of the Project Read Program by discontinuing it after only a single year of full operation. Halting the program at this juncture would seem to represent a more wasteful and extravagant use of resources than allowing its continuation. The influence upon both teachers and pupils appears to be benificial and there is a compelling need to follow

the progress of such reading programs for more extended periods. The increased data thus supplied could do much to provide not only a more sensitive assessment of the current project but also more information regarding the types of changes and possibilities inherent in such programs.

APPENDIX A

Fall 1971

PROJECT READ

TEACHER'S QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF PROJECT READ

1. More material in all curriculum areas. 2
2. More organization within school about materials. 1
3. There should be more specialists in the fields of Art, Music and Science. 1
4. Administrative awareness of what's going on in individual classrooms. 1
5. More security against thefts. 1
6. Lower class register. 3
7. More guidance related services. 2
8. At least 2 corrective reading teachers. 2
9. An E.S.L. teacher. 1
10. More audio-visual materials. 1
11. More decorated halls. 1
12. Less disturbances by children and notes. 3
13. Team teaching. 2
14. More preparation periods. 1
15. Lesson plans for every week unnecessary. 2
16. Optional plan books.
17. More S. S. materials. 2
18. Less emphasis on bulletin boards and 100% attendance. 1
19. Perfect homogeneous grouping. 1
20. More work with supplementary readers. 1
21. Less visual stimuli when reading (too easy to guess). 1
22. More trips. 1
23. More teacher/parent and teacher/pupil exchanges. 1
24. More whole school activities. 1

PROJECT READ

TEACHER'S QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

SUGGESTIONS

1. smaller classes; (7)
2. more paraprofessionals (2)
3. more work with tapes and records
4. a set time for the reading program
5. homonyms, synonyms, antonyms should be stressed
6. more help for children with emotional problems
7. more supplies (4)
8. science and social studies specialists (2)
9. "buy more interest oriented reading materials for comprehension activities"

APPENDIX B

NON PROJECT READ

Teacher Questionnaire Results

STRENGTHS

1. using a large variety of reading material
2. a multi-level approach
3. "encouragement; confidence in them; and patience."
4. individualized instruction (3)
5. variety of reading experience (2)

WEAKNESSES

1. grouping
2. highly disorganized
3. not geared to non-English pupils
4. not enough time for more individualized work (2)
5. class sizes are too large

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT IN NON-READ CLASSROOMS

1. better follow up of methods and texts used through the grades
2. class make-up on a heterogeneous reading basis
3. a departmentalized situation for fifth and sixth graders
4. non-English children should be placed in a class for a month before exposure to a regular class
5. less emphasis on programming
6. have teacher specialized in areas such as science, music, art and physical education

APPENDIX C

Results of the Analysis of Questionnaire Items 4-25

Items	Post			Pre			t
	n_1	$\bar{x}_1$	Sx_1	n_2	$\bar{x}_2$	Sx_2	
4-9	27	15.70	3.24	22	17.18	2.98	-1.643
10	26	71.77	28.29	22	62.73	32.58	1.029
11	26	18.42	18.87	22	14.23	14.59	0.849
12	26	25.23	22.85	21	19.67	15.36	0.95
13	24	11.79	11.73	21	21.33	21.18	-1.90
14	26	55.50	30.18	21	46.62	38.67	0.88
15	26	75.76	16.53	22	55.59	33.52	2.708 *
16	26	28.00	23.19	21	22.38	16.63	0.932
17	25	17.16	20.23	20	13.30	11.33	0.761
18	25	47.60	29.80	21	42.85	33.56	0.507
19	24	26.42	25.52	21	24.66	24.84	0.232
20	26	77.88	25.42	22	72.91	30.71	0.614
21	25	14.92	19.99	21	13.48	20.18	0.24
22	26	74.03	23.11	21	62.62	34.34	1.36
23	26	65.00	27.96	21	51.76	30.95	1.538
24	23	8.74	18.52	18	9.00	18.30	-0.044
25	24	8.38	10.36	19	13.00	22.13	-0.907

* $p < .05$

APPENDIX D

PROJECT READ

Dear Colleague:

In order for your school to better obtain its objectives, it is essential to obtain your views and opinions. This questionnaire is an attempt to assess the viewpoints and opinions of yourself and other teachers.

The answers that you give will be treated as confidential; all data will be treated as group data. We will submit a report of our findings to the New York Board of Education and to you through school administrators so that you have information about how you and other teachers feel about your school and the probable educational problems you face in school.

We hope you will be able to help us by answering the following questions and the attached questionnaire.

NAME _____

1. What do you believe to be the major strengths of your program for teaching children to read?

2. What do you condsider to be the major weaknesses of your program in teaching children to read?

3. What suggestions do you have for improving your school? Briefly list these suggestions; describe them if it is necessary.

PROJECT READ

How desirous would you be to accept each of the opportunities listed below? Write your answer in the box following each opportunity. Use the following response numbers.

1= I would reject the opportunity.
2= I would hesitate to accept the opportunity.
3= I am uncertain.
4= I would probably accept the opportunity.
5= I would grasp the opportunity.

OPPORTUNITY	RESPONSE	OPPORTUNITY	RESPONSE
4. Remain a teacher in my present school for the rest of my educational career.	____	7. Obtain a higher paying teaching job in another system.	____
5. Remain a teacher in my present school system for the remainder of my educational career, but move to a school in a "better neighborhood."	____	8. Obtain a teaching job in which I could have greater decision-making opportunities.	____
6. Remain a teacher at my present grade level(s) for the remainder of my educational career.	____	9. Obtain a higher paying position outside the field of education.	____

Below you are requested to furnish information about your pupils and their parents. Please estimate, to the nearest 10 percent, the percentage of your students to which each of the following statements apply.

	Percent
10. They are interested in academic achievement.	____
11. They are creating discipline problems for you.	____
12. They are creating discipline problems for most other teachers.	____
13. They do not have the intellectual capacity to do the work in their classes with you.	____
14. They were adequately prepared to do the grade level work you expected of them when they entered your classes.	____
15. They will be adequately prepared to do the grade level work others expect of them when they enter classes next year.	____

PROJECT READ

	Percent
16. They will probably go on to some type of college.	____
17. They will probably drop out of school before graduation.	____
18. They readily seek advice about problems related to their classes.	____
19. They readily seek advice about non-academic and personal problems.	____
20. They genuinely seem to like to go to school.	____
21. They genuinely seem to dislike going to school.	____
22. Their parents are interested in the school performance of their children.	____
23. Their parents cooperate with the school when this help is requested.	____
24. Their parents are extremely critical of the school.	____
25. Their parents do not care whether their children may drop out of school.	____

Function No. 33-26-456

SUPPORTIVE TRAINING FOR INEXPERIENCED AND NEW TEACHERS

Background

The development of the STINT proposal was done in conjunction with the Community Superintendent, his Principal's Advisory Council, the Title I coordinator and advisory panels of citizens drawn from various interested groups in District 1 in lower Manhattan. The intent of the program was to improve instruction and services for children by providing a peer centered, in-service training program for new and inexperienced teachers. An experienced master teacher was assigned to each of eight schools in the district. The schools in the program are as follows:

P.S. 4	P.S. 61
P.S. 15	P.S. 64
P.S. 20	P.S. 97
P.S. 34	J.H.S. 71

The proposal explains that "Each master teacher will work with approximately ten teacher trainees who are new, inexperienced or in need of peer help. Such teachers may serve in any grade in the school. The staff participant ratio will consist of one curriculum coordinator to eight master teachers; one teacher to twenty-eight children (½ day for the master, all day for the teacher trainees). The teaching portion of the day for the master teacher may be varied to make sure each teacher in the training program has a chance to observe demonstration lessons. In-service training is the thrust of the program."

Each of the master teachers selected were familiar with the staff and organization of the buildings to which they were assigned. Most had served their respective schools in a variety of capacities for several years. With the exception of one individual, all appeared to have had some prior experience with teacher training programs. The selection of the teacher trainers was done by the principals of the buildings involved with the approval of the Community Superintendent. The selection of trainees was made by the trainers, in most cases in consultation with their respective principals.

STINT is a program that is new neither to District 1 or the New York City schools. The concept of providing special aid to novice teachers in this particular form has been in use for several years. The program was developed as an attempt to meet the orientation needs of new teachers since it was believed that too many potentially valuable teachers were leaving their positions as a result of some of the difficulties they faced in the first year of teaching. It was felt that by providing a resource person who was specifically assigned to training and supporting new personnel, much of this new talent could be developed and saved.

As a result an initial group of trainers, considered by their superiors to be master teachers, were assigned to schools which appeared to have a large number of inexperienced teachers. The program was conducted on a city-wide basis but the greatest number of trainers worked in those districts which had a history of a high rate of teacher turnover. It was in such districts that both the need for initial training and the proportion of new and inexperienced personnel were greatest.

Since it was considered unwise to spread the talents of the trainer too widely, most of the inital programs limited the number of trainees for whom the master teacher would be responsible. The maximum number of trainees was usually ten. The trainers were to provide demonstration lessons, assist in planning and implementing cuuriculum, familiarize trainees with school and classroom routines in general, and be a resource to whom new personnel could turn whenever there was a need. The avowed purpose of the program was to increase the success factor for new teachers by providing them with on the job training in the form of the services of an experienced master teacher.

Several of the trainers in the STINT Program in District 1 had operated in this capacity before. Thus, they were not only experienced teachers, but had several years of experience as trainers as well. In addition, most of the schools in the program had been previously serviced by a teacher trainer and so at least some of the more veteran staff members would have a working knowledge of the type of help that could be expected.

Program Description

The program as described in the original district proposal addresses itself specifically to the need to train new and inexperienced teachers. This training is to be accomplished by an individual who has a peer relationship with the new teachers. In conversations with both the project director and the teacher trainers, this point was emphasized and singled out as an important aspect of the program. Most felt that the traditional subordinate-superordinate relationship between teachers and those responsible for improving their skills impeded rather than enhanced the effectiveness of training programs.

In the program description, reading is isolated as the area of prime concern. It was here that the main energies of the teacher trainers were to be concentrated. "Since...reading continues to be the most challenging educational problem in the district's schools, language arts and the development of reading skills will most often be used as the basis of instruction and demonstration by the master teachers in their respective schools. In this way it is expected that reading scores will improve, teachers will gain greater confidence and the retention of school personnel will be enhanced."

Thus the specific objectives of the program were to improve the reading of children in the demonstration classes (i.e. those rooms serviced by the teacher trainer) and to improve the strategies and techniques of their teachers. An additional expected outcome was that there would be less turnover among new teachers in the STINT Program than among other new teachers either in this or in comparable districts who were not so serviced.

The project proposal also lists the following among its more general expected outcomes: improving services to children, developing competent faculties and reducing teacher frustration by improving performance in the classroom.

As has been indicated, the proposal provided for a project director and eight teacher trainers. The director's salary was paid out of tax levied monies and she held the position of curriculum coordinator for the district. This individual was to hold monthly or bi-monthly meetings of the teacher trainers so that a "uniformly coordinated district approach to teacher training can be effectuated and individualized pedagogic direction and assistance can be rendered to each new and inexperienced teacher until they matured as professionals."

The actual program once put into practice was to provide daily demonstrations of model lessons by the master teachers. These demonstrations were to occupy one half of the teacher trainer's day, each day of the school year. The intent was to provide expert, high quality instruction for the children as well as examples of good pedagogical techniques for the inexperienced or new teachers. In this way it was hoped that the program would have a measurable impact upon the quality of instruction in the schools.

The remainder of the teacher trainer's day would be spent either in attending meetings held by the project director for in-service training or in giving daily individual help to teachers in their assigned schools. Such help would include providing materials, offering critiques of lessons, helping in the planning of lessons and suggesting appropriate teaching strategies, techniques, procedures or routines.

Perhaps the program best explains itself in the following brief abstract:

> "The program is designed to improve instruction and services for children by providing a peer center in-service training program for new and inexperienced teachers with the assistance of a seasoned...master teacher. The program further will provide ½ day of expert teaching by a master teacher as a daily demonstrated effort of efficient teaching.
>
> The project will accomplish its goals through daily demonstration lessons of ½ day per day in each of the subject schools. A further procedure will involve observation and individual conferences with teacher trainees in the various schools. An additional activity will be overall direction and coordination through the District Curriculum Coordinator who will hold periodic meetings to assist the master teacher in improving the efforts of the trainees."

Evaluation Design

The program of evaluation drawn up by Teaching & Learning Research Corp. was designed to test the three major objectives of the program: the improvement of the children's reading skills, the growth of the trainees in regard to teaching strategies and techniques, and a reduction in teacher turnover among those who participated in the program.

In order to test the results in reading, the original research design anticipated the use of an analysis of variance utilizing the difference scores as the dependent variable. The extent of the difference in scores was to be used as one measure of the success of the program in regard to reading achievement. Such an abundant portion of the data on reading was missing, however, that this design was rendered impractical.* In lieu of this method of measurement, a real versus anticipated design was employed where the 1971 achievement score for each child was used to derive an anticipated 1972 score. Each child was thus used as his own control and his actual score on the standardized test was compared to the anticipated score that had been derived. Any significant difference in the real and anticipated scores, differences beyond those that could have been normally expected, would thus be attributable to the influence of this year's program.

To test the improvement of trainees' teaching strategies and techniques, a self-evaluation questionnaire was developed. Trainees were asked to rate themselves in a number of different areas in regard to the types and varieties of teaching techniques they employed.** The questionnaire was administered on a pre and post basis and included the trainees' evaluation of the help they were receiving in the program as well as their rating of their own progress.

To test whether the program was successfully meeting its goal of significantly reducing teacher turnover, the percentage of trainees who left their positions in the schools in District 1 were to be compared to similar percentages for teachers in other districts throughout the city. The original research design had also suggested an additional comparison of the teacher turnover rate for new District 1 teachers who are not served by the program with the similar rate for turnover amongst STINT trainees. Since information on new teacher attrition for the district as a whole was not available at the time the report was written, this additional comparison was not done.

A fourth objective of the evaluation design was to determine whether or not the program was being implemented along the lines suggested in the original proposal. To check on this, it was decided that visits would be made at appropriate intervals to each of the participating schools three times during the year. The classes of trainees would be visited to assess whether demonstration lessons were being conducted according to the plan. The visits would also include informal interviews with both the trainers and the trainees to obtain their viewpoints about the various strengths and weaknesses of the program.

---

* A later section contains a breakdown and some further explanation in regard to problems encountered in data collection.

** The original intent had been to have the master teachers rate their trainees on a pre and post basis. At an early meeting, trainers made it clear that this was inappropriate with their role as a peer and the procedure suggested above was, by common consent, substituted.

Findings

The Program in Operation

The STINT Program appeared to get off to a slow start. One of the teacher trainers suggested that the program had been funded rather late and this impeded initial progress. If true, this was highly unfortunate since most educators would agree that the most critical period for an inexperienced teacher is the beginning part of a new school year. It is then that the routines and procedures that will seriously affect the quality of pupil-teacher rapport are established. Indeed in any program such as STINT, a disproportionate amount of the trainer's overall time and energies must be invested in the initial months of the school year. Several of the trainees pointed this out but a full appreciation of this fact was not reflected in the planning of the trainers. Most of the trainees involved reported a minimum of initial contact. Indeed, as late as the end of October many of them were unaware of their involvement in such a program or were very unclear about the specific help or aid they could have been expecting. In two instances I was told by trainers that they would need another month or so to get their schedules completed and their demonstration lessons organized. This was in early November and obviously represents a misunderstanding of one of the key functions of the program.

During my early visits to the schools, it became evident that the half day of demonstration lesson suggested in the proposal had not been organized. Though this was noted in the interim report, it did not change substantially. In the vast majority of cases the demonstration lessons were not organized in any clear and consistent fashion. It may be that despite the suggestion in the original proposal, the notion that one half of each teaching day be spent doing demonstration lessons is both unrealistic and unnecessary. Many of the trainees did not express such a need and the amount of time allocated may have been excessive. It would appear that a number of the trainers informally reached this conclusion. While a decision to modify the number of demonstrations could represent sound judgement, the extreme infrequency of such demonstrations in many of the schools cannot be justified.

One of the difficulties that the program faced was that there were few first or second year teachers working in some of the schools involved in the project. I was informed that the population of new or inexperienced teachers had been strongly limited by the fact that very few teachers were being hired. Indeed, the district had been forced to "excess" teachers and those excessed would generally tend to be the youngest or most inexperienced. Thus, many of the trainees in the program have had more teaching experience than the writers of the original proposal may have assumed.* This changed both what the trainers could do and how they had to go about doing it. One trainee listed had thirteen years of teaching experience. A number of others were third and fourth year teachers whose competence was attested to by the trainers. It was clear that some of these teachers did not feel they needed the help and viewed it as either obtrusive or an invasion of their classroom

* Twenty-two percent of those trainees who returned questionnaires indicated that they had 4 or more years of teaching experience.

prerogatives. Under such circumstances the teacher trainer is placed in an unenviable and difficult position. It would appear that the choice of which buildings and trainers are to be involved in the program could be profitable re-examined. If a building has a small teaching population or a veteran staff, it may be unnecessary to provide a training program. Similarly, trainers should select trainees who are in clear need of their services and with whom they fully intend to work.

If the program is to continue and if the pattern of very few new teachers being employed persists, then the trainers will have to select their trainees from a list of people varying in either total teaching experience or inexperience at a particular grade level. That selection should be made more thoughtfully, with an eye to focusing the time of the trainer on the people and programs that could most benefit.

One of the program's major problems was that the trainers were saddled with some extra responsibilities that were not directly related to training. teachers. One of the early problems was that some of the trainers were being used as "clusters," that is, to cover classrooms in situations where the teacher was allowed a free period in order to plan or prepare lessons. While this problem appeared to have been largely resolved, some of the principals seem to have handed the teacher trainers jobs that were unrelated to their duties and were often quasi-administrative in nature.

Since the principal selects the trainers, they are likely to be highly susceptible to his influence. If he chooses to use them as unofficial assistant principals, it must be difficult to resist. The same is true if he wishes to delegate other responsibilities that are highly time consuming and not necessarily related to the primary function of training teachers. It was not uncommon to find trainers in charge of assembly programs, audio-visual equipment, previewing and ordering of materials, lunch or playground duty or disciplining children.

Thus, there appeared to be a conflict between the trainer's role as a "teacher of teachers" and the semi-administrative duties that had been assigned. This could involve more than simply diverting time and energy away from the training role. In some cases the trainer had come to be viewed as another administrator. In this role he was unlikely to be seen as a "peer" who could be trusted by trainees to help them work on their weaknesses. The very subordinate-superordinate relationship that the program sought to avoid was jeopardized in these instances.

Some trainers appear to have openly accepted the notion of their role being "third level administration." Others drifted unconsciously into this posture and there appeared to be a loss of job focus without their being clearly aware of it. A smaller group managed to keep the role within the confines of the original intent, as a non-administrative, supportive one in which their time had been freed to help service and train a set number of teachers for whose professional growth they were responsible.

It should be noted at this point that while teachers were not always enthusiastic about the workings of the program, it was extremely rare for anyone to suggest its abolition or respond affirmatively to that suggestion when it was raised. In all cases, both the great potential of the program and the teachers' extreme need for the additional help and services it could supply were emphasized.

In addition, it was exceptionally rare for a trainee to question the competence of the trainer. There was apparent agreement that the trainers were individuals of proven ability who had much to offer in a number of different ways. Comments about the actual operation of the program, with two notable exceptions, were generally not as positive. In many cases the interaction between trainer and trainee did not appear to be either as profitable or as frequent as had been intended. Many of the trainees expressed confusion about the role of the trainer and clearly indicated that there were neither demonstrations nor regular visits to the classroom. For some, contact with the teacher trainer appeared to be virtually nonexistent. Other things appeared to occupy too much of the trainer's time, either by choice or because the situation demanded it. In any case, an important and vital part of the job appeared to be left to chance. Interaction with trainees needs to be systematized, and more regularized patterns of communication and visits established.

In summary, STINT could profit from better planning, organization and execution at all levels. The program's purposes needed to be more clearly defined for the trainers and its services more adequately explained to trainees. The overall operation of the program was not a smooth one. It appeared to be weak in regard to both the quality and quantity of interaction that took place between trainer and trainee. That interaction is not only critical, it should form the very substance of what appears to be a highly necessary program.

Results of Interviews

It is difficult to summarize viewpoints about a program that has, in effect, eight parts that are co-equal in importance and yet vary widely in terms of actual operation. Reports of what trainees say or feel in one school are not necessary indicative of what is happening in another. Neither criticism or praise can be safely spread across a diverse population. The trainers varied in their personal characteristics, background, educational viewpoints and general attitude toward the job. The population of trainees, being much larger, was at least as varied. Thus many of the new teachers expressed conflicting ideas about the strengths and weaknesses of the program and the trainers were similarly divided in their analysis of what constituted the most effective use of their time.

Noting these differences should not obscure the fact that there were many similarities. The types of difficulties that teachers face in regard to planning, discipline and developing classroom routines are generalizable across broad populations. The specifics may be different but the general problems are rather similar. The result was that the types of services

the trainers were most frequently asked to provide were not as disparate as one might assume. Thus, while the viewpoints expressed by teachers and discussed in this section do not represent a total unanimity of opinion, they do reflect some of the general feelings of praise and criticism that were directed at the program.

The most common complaint of trainees voiced repeatedly in many interviews was that they did not know what the trainers were supposed to be accomplishing. Though their views of what the role should entail closely matched the actual job description, many pointed out that these expectations were not being fulfilled. Some felt the trainer's time was not well accounted for. Others felt that it was well accounted for but in non-teacher training tasks that deprived them of an important resource that should have been available. Perhaps the view expressed by one of the teachers in response to the questionnaire is most illustrative of this general viewpoint. Although she signed her name, this particular teacher refused to fill out the questionnaire. To explain her reasons for not doing so she appended a note that indicated since there was no such program in any meaningful sense of that word, she found it impossible to respond to the items. This note appeared on both the pre and post questionnaire. The view it expresses appeared in a number of other instances on item thirteen of the questionnaire (weaknesses of the program) and as has been indicated, in many of the interviews.

Perhaps the most widely praised aspect of the program was that it provided a person to whom new teachers could go for advice and aid. Most trainees felt that just having the trainer available as a resource was important. There was common agreement that new teachers had need for such a resource and that similar aid was unavailable anywhere else. This is not only a comment on the fact that administrators are busily engaged with other aspects of school business. It represents the view that new teachers would prefer to discuss their difficulties with someone who is, at least nominally, a peer rather than a superior.

When the evaluator asked if the role of the teacher trainer was not adequately fulfilled by the "buddy" system in use in some schools, the answer of the majority of trainees was clearly that it was not. Understandably, the more veteran teachers are themselves busy and they would rarely be free to help trainees when the latter might be most in need of their aid. In addition, it was pointed out that even experienced teachers are not always aware of the location of various materials including workbooks, curriculum guides and more recent visual or material aids that are available to teachers. Some of the teachers pointed out that this was more a theoretical strength of the program rather than one they were viewing in operation. None the less, there was considerable agreement about the need for such a resource. In general, the more inexperienced the teacher, the more strongly this view was held. A few of the more experienced teachers who were included among the list of traineers indicated they would have preferred a reading cluster in a sense this is to be expected as their initial need for support and training diminishes.

Another topic that was frequently raised in interviews was one regarding how the trainee had been selected for involvement in the program. It was not unusual to initiate a conversation with a presumed trainee and find that they were surprised to be considered part of the program. Again, this was reflected in questionnaires as well as in interviews. Many teachers reported minimal contact and did not consider themselves new, inexperienced or truly in need of supportive training. The cause for the conflict of views was clearly evident in conversations with the trainers. Teachers viewed the job of the teacher trainer in rather specific terms, mainly as a resource to teachers who were either new to teaching, new to the school, or had recently changed grade levels. Trainers saw their role in more general terms and seemed to feel that they were available to the total staff and not simply the inexperienced segment of it. As one trainer put it, he could not very well turn down a request for help on the basis that the teacher was experienced and should already have that skill.

The point is well taken and constitutes one of the dilemmas of the trainer's role. While some trainers were expanding the sphere of people they serviced, trainees were complaining that the role was spread too thin and that help was not available when needed. Certainly one of the effects of expanding the role is that the program may no longer be organized in any consistent and systemic fashion. Too little is done for too many and because of the lack of focus, the possible influence of a concentrated effort is dissipated and lost. It was for this reason that the original city-wide STINT proposals (as well as the District 1 proposal) specified a maximum number of trainees. While the trainer's judgement as to how he can best serve his peers must alwaysbe allowed for, there is a clear need to respect the priorities of the program. Trainees should be selected through the application of a more vigorous criteria of need. Those selected need to be informed not only of their participation in the program, but what can be expected from such involvement. Too many of the trainees expressed confusion about both these points.

The lack of demonstration lessons was also cited in conversations with many of the teachers. This did not necessarily mean that the trainers rarely met with children. In most cases this was definitely so, but in others it was not. Unfortunately, what often passed for demonstrations was the trainer taking pupils out of the classroom for instruction without the teacher being present. A demonstration lesson without a teacher is a contradiciton in terms. While this may have been useful to the children and appeared to please some of the trainees, it can not be considered a useful training technique. It minimizes rather than maximizes the potential influence of the trainer upon the teaching strategies of individuals in the program. In any event, demonstrations were much too infrequent and in only one building did they appear to occur with any semblance of regularity.

The interviews also produced a conflict of views between the teachers and trainers about the possibility of conducting informal meetings or workshop sessions. Very little of this type of activity was reported and some trainees indicated their interest in meeting with peers and discussing problems of common interest. The trainers pointed out the difficulty of arranging such

meetings. While such sessions were regularly held in one building they did appear difficult to arrange since the only time that was common to most of the trainees was either during lunch or after school. It is unclear whether most of the teachers would truly have preferred such meetings, although it is possible that small, interested groups could have been convened at appropriate intervals.

Results of the Comparison of Reading Scores

Scores attained on the Metropolitan Achievement Tests were used as a means of measuring the reading progress that students in the STINT training classes had made. The test is administered yearly in the New York City schools, usually in April or May. Thus, 1970-71 scores were available for most of those students who had attended schools in District 1 last year and had been present on the days the test was administered. Approximately 40% of the total number of students who were in the program and for whom scores were available, were included in the sample.

As has been indicated, a real versus experimental design was employed to treat the collected data. A student's expected growth was compared to the actual growth that took place as measured by reading scores on the standardized test. The percentage of reading growth that might normally be expected for a year was computed by comparing each child's actual 1970-71 reading achievement score to the national norm for his grade level at the time the test was taken. This resulted in a percentage of anticipated growth that could now be compared to the actual growth that took place on the 1971-72 reading tests.

The results of these comparisons are presented in Table I for seven of the eight schools. There was not data available for the eighth school since most of the trainees involved were teaching at grade levels (K-2) for which two sets of scores were unavailable. It must be understood that trainers were free to select trainees according to need. Thus, all grade levels are represented but in some schools the selection of trainees tended to be concentrated more heavily in the intermediate grades, while in others the vast majority were teachers of the primary grades. There would be few reading scores in a school where most of the trainees taught primary grades. Children in kindergarten and first grade are not tested. Second grades would have only one set of scores available and could not be compared in the manner previously described.* Thus the sample populations in each of the schools were far from equal and this will influence the overall average, as will be shown presently.

---

* Analysis of the results in the second grade will be presented separately.

Table I

Results of the Anticipated Versus Real Analysis of Reading Scores for Pupils in STINT Classrooms*

Anticipated		Real		t	N
Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation		
4.02	1.33	4.29	1.57	3.04*	81
3.33	0.99	3.70	1.68	3.83*	144
4.04	1.12	3.92	1.20	-1.27	70
2.92	0.17	2.77	0.43	-1.37	14
2.80	0.62	2.39	0.44	-4.39	31
3.21	0.55	3.32	0.86	1.25	
5.49	1.12	5.26	1.27	-1.56	47
Total: 3.53	1.10	3.68	1.47	3.17*	387

* $p < .05$

As can be noted from the table, analysis of the data shows that there were significant differences in reading for two of the seven schools reported. The indication is that for these two schools, the reading progress that resulted was beyond that which could have normally been expected. Thus, it is possible to attribute these results to the influence of the program.

In five of the seven schools, no such differences occurred. The growth that took place was not beyond what one could have normally expected had the children continued to progress at the rate anticipated by their past performance.

It should be pointed out that while the mean difference for all the groups combined is also significant, this is due to the heavy influence of the two schools that did experience unexpected reading growth. It was noted earlier that the populations for the different schools were unequal. As is evident, the larger sample size of the two schools reporting significant difference affected the combined results of the total sample.

Four of the seven elementary schools in the program had large enough numbers of second grade pupils for their scores to be presented separately. Since these second grade pupils would have been tested only once, the real versus anticipated design could not be used. Instead, reading scores taken from STINT second grade classes in a particular schools are presented along with the overall performance of second grades within the same building. The data is presented in Table II on the following page.

---

* Scores for the fifth grade were unavailable for the entire district since they had not been returned by the company responsible for scoring the tests.

Table II

STINT and Non-STINT Reading Scores for
Second Grades Within the Same School

School	STINT Second Grade			Non-STINT Second Grade		
	N	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	N
1	43	2.46	0.72	2.40	1.02	114
2	19	1.81	0.18	2.28	.87	83
3	45	2.21	0.72	2.62	1.08	88
4	29	1.85	0.26	2.14	.58	124

No statistical comparisons could be ventured in the cases of these STINT and non-STINT second grade reading scores since there was no way to determine whether the groups were equivalent initially. Student populations within different schools in the district vary and, of course, the ability levels of students within a particular class could in no way be assumed to be equal. While STINT scores appear to be lower in three of the four cases, it must be remembered that trainers selected their trainees on the basis of their inexperience and not on the basis of student performance. It is perfectly possible that the scores could actually reflect more growth on the part of students in these particular classes that the higher scores reflect for students in non-STINT second grades.

In fairness to the program, it must be pointed out that reading is a complex skill, difficult to teach and not easy to measure accruately. The results of standardized tests can provide some idea of the type of growth that is taking place but can not be accepted unquestioningly. In addition, it is probably unlikely that the influence of any program upon the reading progress of pupils will be clearly demonstrated in a year's time. Growth in this area is not alway linear. It is possible that the base level of skills could have been strengthened and broadened without this fact reflecting itself in reading tests taken at the end of a brief period.

Yet another consideration is the fact that reading scores in many of our inner city schools have reflected a disturbing tendency to move further away from national norms as a child progresses upward through the grades. At some point an initial start at containing this "snowballing" effect and reducing the trend for differences to grow rather then fade, must be made. In this regard, it must be noted that reading progress has been made. The fact that all schools have not produced significantly different results should in no way confuse the fact that in all instances, some reading growth has taken place. It is possible that continued implementation of the program will eventually achieve the type of results the planners had intended.

Having explored some of the difficulties that the STINT Program faced, the evaluator would be remiss in not noting its deficiencies as well. In the final analysis the purpose of funding such a program is the belief that

it will produce results beyond those that could have been normally expected without the additional help it provides. There is little evidence that the kind of results that were hoped for actually occurred. In two instances significant differences were recorded and that is promising. In most other situations this was not true.

As was mentioned earlier, it would probably be both wrong and unfair to base the entire evaluation of a program on the capacity to produce a measurable increase in reading skills over a one year period. But even beyond the test results, there is too little evidence that the program was adequately providing help in this area. On the basis of interviews and visits there was no reason to believe that aid in reading was either systematically or consistently provided for trainees. Preparing and helping teachers in this area did not receive the attention it deserved. Interviews suggested that neither demonstrations, observations nor conferences about reading programs or children's particular disabilities were conducted with any regularity by the vast majority of trainers. On the basis of visits it would have been difficult to credit trainers with the results of reading progress even if such progress had been more widespread.

Results of the Questionnaires

Analysis of the questionnaire returned by trainees yielded no conclusive evidence of positive change as a result of the program. On two key sets of questions regarding teacher attitudes and teacher self-appraisal of classroom performance, no significant differences were noted between pre and post scores. The hoped for improvement in teacher strategies and techniques, at least as measured by the trainees temselves, did not occur.* Those trainees who did return both the pre and post questionnaire did not appear to feel that they had experienced any unusual or unexpected growth in either attitudes or teaching skills.

Indeed, there were only two instances in which significant difference did result and these were in a negative direction. Trainees rated classroom demonstration lessons and teacher training workshops significantly lower at the end of the year than at the beginning. One would have to feel that these two areas are extremely important and the lower ratings should provide cause for some concern about the general effectiveness of an aspect of the program that was cited as important in the original proposal. The results of the analysis of questionnaire items dealing with teacher attitudes and teacher self-appraisal of performance are included in tables III and IV on the following page.

---

* It must be noted that though normal follow-up techniques were employed, only 18 of 81 trainees in the program chose to return the pre and post questionnaires. The reasons for this are unclear and could be due to either the length of the questionnaire of the absence of strong feeling (pro or con) about the program.

Table III

Analysis of Trainees Evaluation of Their Own Teaching Performance

	Mean	S.D.	t
Pre	31.39	5.75	
Post	31.05	5.23	0.34

not significant at .05 level

Table IV

Analysis of Questionnaire Items Dealing with Attitudes of Trainees Toward Teaching

	Mean	S.D.	t
Pre	23.55	5.72	
Post	22.83	3.11	0.57

not significant at .05 level

Item seven on the questionnaire contained a series of questions in which trainees were asked to rate their trainers in three basic areas: interpersonal relationships, teaching ability, and personal attributes. As has been indicated, on two of the three items involving teaching ability there was a significant drop in the post as compared to the pre-program ratings. It should also be noted that on the third item, classroom teaching, the trainers as a group were given a good to superior ratings.Similar ratings resulted in the items pertaining to personal attributes and interpersonal relationships. A breakdown by items is given in Table V. In order to better understand the items it should be remembered that the rating scale went from one to five, with the lower score indicating "poor" and the higher one "excellent." (See next page.)

Questionnaire items eight through ten required respondents to indicate any improvement in their general teaching effectiveness as a result of their participation in the STINT Program. Item eleven asked for a rating of the overall effectiveness of the program. Again, there were no significant differences between pre and post program responses on any of these items.* Since the general breakdown of the responses may prove of interest, particularly to those connected with the program, the results are listed in Tables VI-IX. To facilitate understanding, the questionnaire item is presented first. This is followed by a breakdown of the percentage of responses in each of the answer categories that were provided for that particular item. (See next page for Tables VI-IX.)

* t-tests were performed on each of these items and these results are included separately with each table

Table V
Results of the Trainees' Evaluation of
Trainers Presented By Item

	Pre		Post		
Item	Rating	S.D.	Rating	S.D.	t
7.1a	3.50	1.17	3.67	0.97	0.41
7.1b	3.50	1.26	3.38	0.96	0.40
7.1c	3.19	1.17	3.19	0.91	0.00
7.1d	3.00	1.07	2.88	0.83	1.00
7.1e	3.50	1.26	3.50	0.82	0.00
7.1f	3.44	0.61	3.00	0.61	1.54
7.2a	3.58	1.08	3.42	1.08	1.00
7.2b	4.00	1.08	3.61	1.04	1.81*
7.2c	3.55	1.13	2.67	1.50	3.41*
7.3a	3.60	1.24	3.80	1.15	0.72
7.3b	3.80	1.15	3.73	1.03	0.37
7.3c	3.33	1.39	3.27	0.96	0.20
7.3d	4.00	1.00	3.53	0.99	1.70
7.3e	3.76	1.15	3.71	0.92	0.27
7.4	3.57	1.02	3.29	1.07	1.17

* significant at the .05 level

Table VI
Results of Teacher Response to Item
Eight of the Questionnaire Given by Percent

Item 8: Do you think you are more effective as a result of having worked with a STINT trainer?

Possible Responses	Pre	Post	t
Definitely Yes	26.3%	16.6%	0.56
Probably Yes	18.3%	38.8%	
No	36.8%	27.7%	
Do not know	18.4%	16.6%	

Table VII

Results of Teacher Response to Item Nine of the Questionnaire Given by Percentage

Item 9: Do you consider yourself to be better able to deal with the learning and emotional problems that arise in a classroom than if you had not been a STINT trainee?

Possible Responses	Pre	Post	t
Definitely yes	28.9%	16.6%	0.69
Probably yes	13.1	22.2	
No	42.1	44.4	
Do not know	13.7	16.6	

Table VIII

Results of Teacher Response to Item Ten Given by Percentage

Item 10: How would you rate the morale of the STINT trainees as compared with that of other beginning teachers you know who are not receiving assistance from the STINT teacher trainer?

Possible Responses	Pre	Post	t
Much better	14.7%	5.5%	0.69
Somewhat better	14.7	27.7	
About the same	20.5	16.6	
Somewhat worse	0	0	
No basis for judgement	50	50	

Table IX

Results of Teacher Response to Item Eleven Given by Percentage

Item 11: Overall, how effective is the STINT program in this school?

Possible Responses	Pre	Post	t
Excellent	5.5%	16.2%	0.00
Very good	11.1	13.5	
Good	22.2	13.5	
Fair	16.6	24.3	
Poor	11.1	5.4	
Unsatisfactory	22.2	10.8	
No basis for judgement	11.1	16.2	

Items twelve through fifteen deal with specific strengths and weaknesses of the STINT Program as well as suggestions or recommendations for improvement. Of the 35 post program questionnaires that were returned. 24 respondents chose to answer one or more of these questions. There is no objective means of evaluating these responses and so no attempt at comment will be made here. Because the responses could prove useful to individuals in the program, the comments were categorized and are presented in Appendix A. Suggestions or responses that dealt basically with similar ideas were combined and the frequency of the comment is indicated by the number that follows it. To the extent that it was possible, the wording used attempts to duplicate both the manner and the intent of the statements made by different respondents. Appendix B includes suggestions and recommendations for improving the program.

Results of the Comparison of Teacher Turnover Rates for STINT Trainees

The number of trainees who resigned or left the schools during or at the conclusion of the year were noted. The original intent was to compare the STINT turnover rate to the turnover rate of the rest of District 1. These rates were not available for the district as a whole at the time this report was written and thus the comparison could not be made.

Of the original 81 trainees in the program, 14 had definitely left the schools or tendered their resignations as of the end of May. This represents 17% of the original group. It must be pointed out that the turnover rate of the junior high school was rather high and this inflated the overall percentage. Fifty percent of the original list of 10 trainees left the junior high school before the end of the year.* The figure for the elementary schools, exclusive of the junior high, is 12.7 percent. While neither of these figures compare favorably with turnover rates for elementary and junior high schools throughout the city as a whole, it would be unfair to make such comparisons directly since each district has its own set of unique circumstances. Still, the turnover rate is not promising in a year when teaching jobs are extremely scarce and it should be noted that the final figures could well be higher since several trainees indicated they were unsure about returning the following year.

Table X

A Comparison of the Turnover Rate of STINT Trainees to 1970-71 Rates for New York City Schools as a Whole

	STINT		New York City 1970-71**	
	Elementary	Junior High	Elementary	Junior High
Total Number of Teachers:	71	10	27,108	15,051
Resignations:	9	5	1,187	199
Percent of Attrition:	12.7	50	4.4	1.4

* This figure does not include some of the new teachers who replaced the original trainees and also left these positions prior to May

** No separate statistics were available for new or inexperienced teachers on a city-wide basis.

Problems of Data Collection

The population in this district can be characterized as somewhat transient in nature. Many children are recent arrivals from other countries, cities or districts, and have not resided in the district or gone to the same school three years consecutively; therefore it was not possible to get three, or even two scores for many of the children in the sample. In addition, many of the children are bi-lingual, or do not yet speak English sufficiently to be administered the MAT. Other problems involved sheer logistics. When it was possible to have access to green cards kept be teachers in individual classrooms, this was not a problem. However, since for various reasons the green cards were not accessible to us, often the records in the school office had to be gone through. Not all children's scores are in the office records. Sometimes children were tested too late for the results to be machine scored, and these scores are therefore not in the office. Some years some children were simply not tested because they were absent the day the test was administered.

Following is a breakdown of scores recorded, by school.

P.S. #20: All 1972 reading scores were received, 3/4ths of 1971, and 1969 scores from 2 classes.

P.S. #34: 1972 reading scores for 2nd graders only. One 4th grade class scores for three years.

P.S. #4: Majority of scores for last 2 years recorded. All of reading scores available for last 3 years.

P.S. #97: All material was available.

P.S. #15: All fifth and sixth grade scores available for 1971-72. 2nd, 3rd and 4th grade reading scores all available for 1972, only part of 1971, very few for 1970.

J.S. #71: Only 8th grade reading scores available, 9th grade scores already sent to high schools and 7th grade scores had not come in yet.

P.S. #61: All reading scores for 1971-72, about half for 1970-71, and few for 1969-70.

P.S. #64: No data available at this time.

Recommendations

The potential usefullness of the STINT program was frequently attested to by trainees. Despite criticisms and reservations, the point that was often stressed was the immense need for the kind of services trainers could supply in regard to help with curriculum and teaching techniques. Despite the fact that there are decreasing numbers of truly inexperienced teachers in the majority of the target schools, the program would probably prove useful for another year if some major modifications were made.

1. Perhaps the most important need is for the role of the trainer to be clearly defined and the job responsibilities for which he or she will be held accountable specified. In too many instances, trainers viewed themselves as general handymen who served the school well in a variety of situations. The role should be limited to working closely and effectively with those trainees who have been selected. Accountability should be fixed by making clear the curricular areas for which they will be held responsible and future funding should depend upon the achievement of clearly measurable progress in these areas. The trainers' role was not conceived of as a "global" job in which they worked with everyone. STINT was designed as a limited program of visible help for a few. Its effectiveness was clearly diminished by a misuse or misunderstanding of these intentions.

2. Trainers must totally organize their programs prior to the beginning of school in September. The list if trainees must be selected and the activities, meetings and demonstrations for the first several weeks of school should be planned and prepared before school starts. It is likely that at least one meeting of the trainers and the project director should be held in late August before teachers return to the schools. There is a similar need for trainers to hold meetings with trainees in the early days of the new school year. At such meetings ideas could be exchanged, major problems defined, and priorities determined. There is a compelling need to organize earlier and more effectively. Trainees must be provided with a better understanding of what help can be expected from trainers.

3. The selection of trainees ought to be made more judiciously. Those who are included in the program should be either inexperienced, new to their current jobs, or in need of some specific help in the classroom. The selection of trainees should not be based upon the necessity to meet some arbitrary figure arrived at in the proposal. Such a consideration also involves the need to select the schools that will be involved in the program with more insight. Schools with larger numbers of inexperienced personnel or special problems should be given priority.

   In the course of my visits to the schools, it was suggested that more trainers be placed in the junior high schools since there is a greater need for their services at that level. The teacher turnover is greater, and there is a continuous flow of inexperienced personnel, many of whom are teaching in unfamiliar content areas and require the help of a master teacher. It is this type of consideration that should inform and direct the energies of the planners in selecting appropriate schools.

In regard to the specific suggestion about adding trainers to the junior high, the point is debatable. While the trainer at this level appeared to be doing an outstanding job, teacher turnover was not diminished and there was no significant difference in the reading progress of the students over that of the previous year. It seems not only possible, but likely that concentrating the effort to improve skills when students are younger and in their more formative stages of development would prove more rewarding. Remediation would appear to present more difficult and demanding problems. While help is necessary, it may prove unwise to attempt to concentrate too much of the limited resources that are available at this level.

4. The role of the project director should be expanded and the teacher trainers made more responsible to that person. The project director would thus assume the responsibility of not only holding monthly meetings but overseeing the program generally to ensure that its goals are being met. Planning would be done jointly with building principals and individual trainers to determine building needs and the way the program could be most effectively organized in a particular school. Again, this would probably necessitate a series of meetings prior to the beginning of the school year.

5. Any new proposal should not mandate ½ a day of demonstration lessons. This goal was not met and was probably impractical. Such a design is too rigid and may not always represent the best use of the trainer's time. On the other hand there is a definite need for the trainers to establish a schedule of regular visits with their trainees. This would include a combination of meetings, demonstrations and classroom visits. Contact with trainees was too infrequent and chaotic. Interaction with trainees too often appeared to be left to chance and there was little evidence of joint planning, discussions or visitations on a regular basis. Under these circumstances it becomes too easy for the trainer to be tied up elsewhere and for the trainee to cease looking to them for help. More extensive planning resulting in definite and regular interaction would do much to maintain proper channels of communication. It should not be left to the trainee to seek out the trainer only when the former feels he has need of the latter's services.

Conclusion

In summary, the evaluator would suggest that the program be continued for another year. The program would appear to have a great potential usefulness. The additonal year could provide the opportunity to make changes and utilize past experience. In additon, the reading results over a two year period would provide a more accurate assessment of the possible benefits of the program in this area.

It would seem that STINT operated with some correctable deficiencies. There is reason to believe that a serious attempt to eliminate these deficiencies could produce more promising results. It should be made clear that reading improvement is the major goal of the program and that systematic aid to teachers (in this as well as other areas) should be the main priority of trainers. Continuation of the program beyond the additional year should be based completely on the ability to successfully meet these specific goals.

APPENDIX A

A Compilation of Teacher Responses Regarding Strengths and Weaknesses of the STINT Program

Strengths	Number Responding
Provides help in regard to materials and curriculum	3
Resource person for support	3
Has no strengths	2
Demonstration lessons and joint planning	2
Has no strengths beyond its philosophy	1
Am not involved in such a program	1
Helping teacher learn about the school	1
Furnishes new ideas	1
"A shoulder to cry on"	1

Weaknesses	Number Responding
Not really involved in any such program	4
Lack of any planned program to help guide trainees	3
Teacher trainer spread too thin	3
No demonstrations	2
Am unfamiliar with STINT; have rarely talked to the trainer	2
Program not in operation	1
Program has no weaknesses	1
Insufficient personnel	1
Teacher trainer used as an A.P.	1
Teacher trainer has not been used as such in the building	1
Not enough reliable follow-up	1

APPENDIX B

A Compilation of Recommendations and Suggestions in Regard to the STINT Program

	Number Responding
The teacher trainers should be freed of administrative duties and responsibilities	3
The program should be discontinued and the money used in more fruitful ways	2
Orientation for new teachers should be held in early September	1
Program should provide more materials	1
Devote more time to teaching methodology	1
Hold more workshops	1
Provide closer supervision of the trainer to insure he is doing his proper job	1
Focus on one content area and work with fewer teachers	1
Provide a STINT trainer for each content area in the junior high school	1

APPENDIX C

Supportive Training for Inexperienced and New Teachers

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

As teachers currently involved in the STINT program, we are asking your cooperation in helping us evaluate its progress. The questions that follow are concerned with your own self-appraisal in regard to both your own teaching and the help you are receiving. Your responses will, of course, be anonymous and information will be utilized solely for the purpose of examining various aspects of the program.

1. Which of the following licenses do you hold? (Circle all that apply)

   a. Early Childhood
   b. Common Branches
   c. Substitute
   d. Conditional Substitute
   e. Emergency Substitute
   f. Other _____

2. What type of teacher preparation did you have?

   a. Regular undergraduate teacher education program
   b. Regular graduate teacher education program
   c. Intensive (short-term) graduate teacher education program
   d. Professional courses necessary to qualify for substitute license (not a formal program)
   e. Other _____

3. Is this your first year of teaching?

   a. Yes b. No

4. If NO, how many years have you taught?

   a. 2 - 3 b. 4 - 5 c. 6 - 10 d. more than 10

5. Listed below are some areas of concern to teachers. In Column 1 please estimate your current competency in each aspect as follows:

   1. means "Excellent"
   2. means "Good"
   3. means "Fair"
   4. means "Poor"
   5. means "Totally Unsatisfactory"
   9. means "Does Not Apply"

Appendix C - continued

ASPECT	Column 1 Self Appraisal
1. General methods of teaching	1 2 3 4 5 9
2. Methods of teaching reading	1 2 3 4 5 9
3. Planning lessons--daily, weekly, unit, term	1 2 3 4 5 9
4. Use of instructional materials	1 2 3 4 5 9
5. Evaluation of learning, test, grades, etc.	1 2 3 4 5 9
6. Motivating a class	1 2 3 4 5 9
7. Understanding children's behavior	1 2 3 4 5 9
8. Routines of class and classroom management	1 2 3 4 5 9
9. Providing for individual differences	1 2 3 4 5 9
10. Group activities--large and small	1 2 3 4 5 9
11. Pupil-teacher relationships	1 2 3 4 5 9
12. Teacher-paraprofessional relationships	1 2 3 4 5 9
13. Teacher-principal relationships	1 2 3 4 5 9
14. School-community relations	1 2 3 4 5 9
15. Self-evaluation (strengths and weaknesses)	1 2 3 4 5 9

6. Listed below are aspects of teaching about which teachers have differing attitudes.

   In Column 1 please indicate your present feeling in each area as follows:

   1. means "Completely Positive"
   2. means "Generally Positive"
   3. means "Neutral"
   4. means "Generally Negative but Aware of Rewards
   5. means "Completely Negative"
   9. means "Do Not Wish To Reply"

Appendix C - continued

ASPECT	Column 1 - Present Attitude
1. Teaching in general	1 2 3 4 5 9
2. Teaching in urban schools	1 2 3 4 5 9
3. Working with students from low socio-economic backgrounds	1 2 3 4 5 9
4. Working with students from middle socio-economic backgrounds	1 2 3 4 5 9
5. Working with students from high socio-economic backgrounds	1 2 3 4 5 9
6. Working with children who learn very quickly	1 2 3 4 5 9
7. Working with children who learn slowly	1 2 3 4 5 9
8. Working with children who have a physical style of learning	1 2 3 4 5 9
9. Working with children with behavior problems	1 2 3 4 5 9
10. Your feelings of self-confidence as a teacher	1 2 3 4 5 9

7. Consider the work of the teacher trainer assigned to this school in the following areas using this scale:

1. means poor
2. means fair
3. means good
4. means superior
5. means excellent
9. no basis for rating

1. Interpersonal relationships

a. ___with supervisors
b. ___with trainees
c. ___with other teachers
d. ___with parents
e. ___with children
f. ___with auxiliary personnel

Appendix C - continued

2. Teaching ability

   a. ____ classroom teaching
   b. ____ classroom demonstration lessons
   c. ____ teacher training workshops

3. Personal attributes

   a. ____ energy
   b. ____ alertness
   c. ____ adaptability
   d. ____ professional attitude
   e. ____ appearance

4. Overall effectiveness ____

8. Do you think you are more effective in the classroom as a result of having worked with a STINT teacher trainer? (Circle answer)

   a. Definitely YES b. Probably YES c. NO d. Don't Know

9. Do you consider yourself to be better able to deal with the learning and emotional problems that arise in a ghetto classroom than if you had not been a STINT trainee? (Circle answer)

   a. Definitely YES b. Probably YES c. NO d. Don't Know

10. How would you rate the morale of the STINT trainees as compared with that of other beginning teachers you know who are not receiving assistance from the STINT teacher trainer? (Circle appropriate number)

    1. Much better morale than non-STINT beginning teachers
    2. Somewhat better morale than non-STINT beginning teachers
    3. About the same morale as non-STINT beginning teachers
    4. Somewhat worse morale than non-STINT beginning teachers
    5. Much worse morale than non-STINT beginning teachers
    9. No basis for making this judgement

Appendix C - continued

11. Overall, how effective is the STINT program in this school?

1. ____ Excellent
2. ____ Very Good
3. ____ Good
4. ____ Fair
5. ____ Poor
6. ____ Unsatisfactory
9. ____ No basis for judging beyond my own experiences

12. In your opinion, what are the major specific strengths of the STINT program?

13. In your opinion, what are the major specific weaknesses of the STINT program?

14. What recommendations would you suggest to improve the STINT program for next year?

15. If you have any comments to make regarding STINT that you have not already reported in this questionnaire please do so now. (Use back of page if needed.)

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION

Function # 33-26-453

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANTS

GRADES 3-6

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANTS
GRADES 3-6

I. Program Description

A. General

The upper Grade Elementary School Educational Assistants Program involves 23 educational assistants assigned to grades three through six in 12 schools of District 1. Appendix I presents a list of the educational assistants involved, as well as the teachers and schools. The training of these educational assistants is under the overall direction of Mrs. Frances Kirschner, who is assisted by two auxiliary trainers, Mrs. Gwendolyn Gilbert, and Mrs. Daisy Montanez.

B. Program Objectives

The daily work of the educational assistants is largely determined by the teacher's direction. However, there are certain overall needs which it is intended that the educational assistants meet. These form the program objectives, which we may divide into three parts; Parent-school contact, individualization of instruction, and reading performance.

1. Parent-school contact One function it is hoped that the educational assistant will serve because they often are members of the community themselves, is to assist the parents of the students in the school in finding out more about what goes on in the classroom and what is happening with their children. They can do this by encouraging parents to talk to teachers or other school personnel, by helping them find the right people to talk to, and by talking to parents themselves about what is going on in the classroom, and about their children.

2. Individualization of instruction. In the simplest terms, the educational assistant is another adult in the classroom. This can be useful in several ways. The educational assistant can take over routine administration and paperwork, freeing the teacher. The educational assistant can take over part of the class, which means that children are effectively in smaller classes, and get more instruction. Or the educational assistant can handle students with special problems, as the Teacher conducts the main lesson. In all these ways, and perhaps others as well, it is intended that the educational assistant's presence leads to children's getting more individual attention.

3. Performance A basic intent of the educational assistants program is to facilitate children's learning how to read, that is, to increase their reading performance over what it would be if the educational assistant were not present.

C. Evaluation Objectives

There are several evaluation objectives. The first is to see whether or not the educational assistants are functioning in such a fashion as to improve community contact with schools, and to permit teachers to individualize instruction. The second is to see whether the presence of educational assistants is having the desired effect on reading scores, that is, improving them relative to the scores without their presence. The third is to obtain some information about just what the educational assistants in fact do during reading instruction, so as to see the relationship between their classroom behavior and improvement of reading performance, if any.

II. Evaluation Instruments and Evaluation Data

A. Questionnaires

Four questionnaires were administered in the course of the evaluation, to the principals of the schools involved in the program, to the teachers to whom the educational assistants were assigned, to the educational assistants themselves, and to a sample of parents in the classes with educational assistants. All the questionnaires are included in Appendix II. The questionnaire to the Principals had to do with their impressions of parent involvement, child's behavior, and teacher morale. The questionnaire to the teachers investigated how much the teachers were helped in improving contact with the parents, and how much the educational assistants helped them individualize instruction. The questionnaire to the educational assistants had to do with their activities in promoting parent-school contact, and the questionnaire to the parents had to do with how much they had been helped by the educational assistants activities.

The returns on the questionnaires are as follows. For the Administration Questionnaire, 11 of the 12 Principals involved completed the return. For the Teacher's Questionnaire, 20 of the 23 teachers completed the return. For the Educational Assistants Questionnaire, 19 of the 23 Educational Assistants involved completed the return. For the Parents Questionnaire, 12 of the 92 possible respondents completed the return.

B. Direct Observation

The reading instruction of each of the classrooms in which there was an educational assistant was observed once during the academic year. The observation lasted for half an hour and the observer noted, every minute, which category the educational assistants activity during that minute fell into. The categories were (1) Direct instruction of a student or group of students, (2) Supplementary instruction, that is assisting students at following the teacher's direct instruction, (3) Record Keeping and Maintainence directly related to reading instruction, (4) Other managerial activity not related to reading instruction, and (5) Inactivity. The observation seemed quite easy to do, as the educational assistants almost invariably had one function, which they performed during the entire reading period. A copy of the observational scheme is included as Appendix III.

C. Reading Scores

The students scores on the Metropolitan Achievement Test for April 1971, and April 1972 were obtained. Due to certain problems in data collection it was possible to obtain 1971 scores for only 6 classrooms out of the 23 schools and 1972 scores for only 18 classrooms out of the 23 schools.

III. Evaluation Results

A. Parent-School Contact

The parent-school contact objective, it will be recalled, had to do with parents being able to get more contact with the school in a variety of ways. The evaluation data most relevant to them are the returns from the parent questionnaire, which are summarized in Table 1. The most relevant questions are questions 1, 3, and 4. For question 1, involving communication with the child's teacher, 75% of the parents found the educational assistants helpful. For question 3, involving discussing the child's problems, 83% of the parents found the educational assistant helpful. For question 4, involving discussing the child's activities, 75% of the parents found the educational assistant helpful. We conclude, then, that this objective was met staisfactorily; the parents reported their contact with the school to be facilitated by the educational assistants.

The results of the questionnaire administered to the educational assistants suggests that they in fact behaved so as to facilitate parent-school contact. These results are summarized in Table 2. The results show that the bulk of the educational assistants, 85%, sometimes or frequently talk to parents about school matters (Question 1), and the bulk, 85% of the educational assistants sometimes or frequently encourage parents to talk to the teacher (Question 2). Moreover, although a majority (66%) of the educational assistants are never involved with parents association meetings a significant minority (34%) are, sometimes or frequently.

The results of the teacher questionnaire (Table 3), and the administration questionnaire (Table 4), confirm the picture from the teacher's and administrator's side. As question 1 of the teacher questionnaire shows, 85% of the teachers thought that the educational assistants had helped them improve their contact with the parents. The same held true of the Principals. As question 1 shows, 82% of the Principals thought there had been an increase of parent involvement in their school.

To summarize, then, all the data indicate that everybody involved with the program reports an increase of parent-school contact.

B. Individualization of Instruction

This objective, it will be recalled, involves the teacher being freed from administrative and managerial chores so as to be free to individualize instruction, and in addition, both the teacher and the educational assistant being freer to deal with individual students. There are two sources of information on how this objective was met; the first is the teacher's reports, and the second is the direct observation of classroom behavior.

The results of the teacher questionnaire are presented in Table 3. The questions relevant to this objective are questions 2, 3 and 4, which have to do with reading instruction, individualized instruction, and special attention to students who need it, respectively. The results are quite clearcut; the bulk of the teachers found the educational assistants helped them very much on these matters and 95% to 100% reported themselves helped some or very much.

This is completely confirmed by the results of classroom observation which are reported in Table 4. As Table 4 shows, 81% of the educational assistant's time was spent in direct instruction and 11% in supplementary instruction, meaning that 92% of the educational assistants time was spent in reading related activity. When the data are further broken down by classroom, it emerges that in two of the classrooms the educational assistant was used to supplement the teacher's direct instruction, in one classroom the educational assistant was used to keep order while a group of students were taught by the teacher, and in the remainder of the classrooms the educational assistant taught a section of reading instruction.

Although the present evaluation was not aimed at assessing the quality of instruction, the present author had occasion to observe about a third of the classrooms himself, and can report that the educational assistants were performing in a competent, professional, manner. In summary, as a result of the presence of educational assistants, instruction was more individualized, and teachers reported it as such.

C. Performance Objectives

The performance objective is quite simple--as a result of the presence of educational assistants the students should improve their scores on the Metropolitan Achievement Test during the year when they had instruction more than they did over the previous years, when they did not have instruction.

This objective was not met. On the average the students gained 0.52 grade equivalents over their prior years of instruction, and gained 0.59 grade equivalents over the current 1971-1972 year. The superiority of the present instructional year's gain to the previous year's gain is small, 0.07 months, and not statistically significant.

The data were cross-checked for internal consistency, and they appear to be internally consistent. The reading level of all third grade students in the sample is 2.72, and that predicted on the basis of the current year's growth is 2.77, which agrees almost exactly. The reading level of all the fourth grade students in the sample is 3.35, and that computed on the basis of the current year's growth is 3.36, which agrees almost exactly.

We conclude, then, that the performance objective is not met.

IV. Summary

The results of this evaluation are simply and briefly stated:

1. The presence of the educational assistants was reported, by all concerned, to increase parent involvement with the school.

2. The presence of the educational assistants was reported by the teachers to permit them to individualize instruction, and classroom observation supported this claim.

3. The presence of educational assistants did not apparently improve the rate of growth on the Metroplitan Achievement Test, for the students involved, which remained at between 0.5 and 0.6 grade equivalents per year.

V. Conclusions and Recommendations

All of the people questioned reported the program as satisfactory to them. In addition, it did permit more individualization of instruction, and more special assistance to students. However, the specific performance objective of an improvement in reading scores was not met.

As the program seems satisfactory to all concerned, it is recommended that it be continued. Perhaps the expectation that this kind of educational intervention will have a significant effect on reading performance is unwarranted. Certainly the lack of increase in achievement cannot be attributed to the educational assistants, as they are performing the job they were trained to do. However, in order to maximize the chance of improving reading performance it is recommended that increased attention be given to this problem in their training. However, the educational assistants are clearly not primarily responsible for the quality of reading instruction - this is an issue to which all the schools in the district should give some attention.

The educational assistants serve many functions which should make the classroom atmosphere more conducive to learning. The following beneficial activities have been observed.

1. Translating when necessary between teacher and child and teacher and parent.

2. Bilingual instruction in all academic areas, particularly in language arts and reading.

3. Participating in individual and small group instruction.

4. Reinforcing skills already presented earlier by the teacher.

5. Giving individual support to children who need special attention, or with special problems.

6. Assisting in maintaining classroom routines such as lunch time and materials distribution.

7. Assisting in clerical tasks

8. Acting as liaison between parents and teachers; explaining to parents school functions, and explaining to teachers special community problems.

9. Preparing instructional materials such as a reading tree, wood cards, bingo games, etc.

10. Assisting in recreational activities, dance, arrival and dismissal procedures.

All these activities free teachers to attend to individual instructional problems and to spend more time preparing materials, which should ultimately lead to higher achievement in these classes. Why it hasn't greatly influenced achievement during this school year may be due to special problems not isolated in this evaluation. Further studies of the interaction between teachers and educational assistants, and the resultant instructional role of the assistants will be necessary to find out why the addition of assistants did not have the anticipated effect on students' measured academic achievement.

Table 1: Summary of Parent Questionnaire - Percentage of Yes, No and Don't Know Responses to each of the Four Questions

Question	Response		
	Yes	No	Don't Know
1. Has the Educational Assistant made it easier for you to communicate with your child's teacher?	75%	8%	17%
2. Has the educational assistant made it easier for you to get involved with school activities?	25%	25%	50%
3. Has the educational assistant made it easier for you to discuss with the teacher the problems your child is having in school?	83%	17%	0%
4. Has the educational assistant made it easier for you to discuss with the teacher what your child does in school?	75%	17%	8%

Table 2: Summary of Educational Assistant Questionnaire. Percentage of Never, Sometimes and Frequently responses to each of the Questions.

Question	Response: Never	Sometimes	Freqeuntly
1. How often in a typical week do you talk to a parent of a child in your class about school matters?	5%	63%	32%
2. How often in a typical week do you encourage a parent to talk to the teacher or someone else at school about their child?	5%	63%	32%
3. How often in a typical month do you help to organize parent's association meetings, or are you involved with them in some other way?	66%	17%	17%

Table 3: Summary of Teacher Questionnaire. Percentage of none, some, and very much responses to each of the questions.

Question	Response: none	some	very much
1. How much has the educational assistant helped you to improve your contact with parents?	15%	25%	60%
2. How much help has the educational assistant been to you in your reading instruction?	5%	25%	70%
3. How much help has the educational assistant been in helping you to provide more individualized instruction?	0%	25%	75%
4. How much help has the educational assistant been in providing special attention to students who need it, or freeing you to provide attention?	5%	15%	80%

Table 4: Summary of classroom observation. Percentage of time spent by teachers in each observational category.

Observational Category	Percentage of time spent in Behavior
Direct instruction	81%
Supplementary Instruction	11%
Record Keeping and Maintenance	1%
Other	7%

Appendix A: List of Upper Grade Educational Assistants and Teachers by School

School	Number of Teachers	Number of Educational Assistant	Grade Level Served
PS 4	3	3	3 & 4
PS 15	3	3	1, 3, & 4
PS 19	2	2	3
PS 34	2	2	3 & 4
PS 61	1	1	5
PS 63	1	1	3
PS 64	2	2	4
PS 97	1	1	3
PS 110	2	2	3 & 6
PS 134	2	2	3
PS 140	2	2	3
PS 160	2	2	3

E.S.E.A.

APPENDIX B

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Teacher:

We would like your help in evaluating the effectiveness of Educational Assistants. Could you please answer the following questions.

1. How much has the Educational Assistant helped you to improve your contact with parents?

   NONE ____ SOME ____ VERY MUCH ____

2. How much help has your Educational Assistant been to you in your reading instruction?

   NONE ____ SOME ____ VERY MUCH ____

3. How much help has your Educational Assistant been in helping to provide more individualized instruction?

   NONE ____ SOME ____ VERY MUCH ____

4. How much help has the Educational Assistant been in providing special attention to students who need it, or freeing you to provide attention?

   NONE ____ SOME ____ VERY MUCH ____

E.S.E.A.

APPENDIX C

ADMINISTRATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Principal:

We would like your help in evaluating the effectiveness of the Educational Assistants. Would you please indicate how you feel about the following statements.

1. Parent's involvement with the school has increased during 1971-1972 school year.

   AGREE ____ UNCERTAIN ____ DISAGREE ____

2. The morale of the teachers with Educational Assistants in their classes has increased.

   AGREE ____ UNCERTAIN ____ DISAGREE ____

3. Children's behavior has improved and their attitude towards school has become more positive.

   AGREE ____ UNCERTAIN ____ DISAGREE ____

E.S.E.A.

APPENDIX D

EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANT QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Educational Assistant:

We are interested in getting a picture of how you are involved with parents outside of school. Would you please answer the following questions.

1. How often in a typical week do you talk to a parent of a child in your class about school matters?

   NEVER ____ SOMETIMES ____ FREQUENTLY ____

2. How often in a typical week do you encourage a parent to talk to the teacher or someone else at school about their child?

   NEVER ____ SOMETIMES ____ FREQUENTLY ____

3. How often in a typical month do you help to organize parent's Association meetings, or are you involved with them in some other way?

   NEVER ____ SOMETIMES ____ FREQUENTLY ____

E.S.E.A.

APPENDIX E

PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE
(CUESTIONARIO PARA LOS PADRES)

Dear Parent:
(Querido(a) padre o madre:)

The questions below are designed to see how much the Educational Assistants are helping you and your child. Please answer them as fairly as possible.

(Las siguientes preguntas son para determinar cuanto estan ayudando a Usted y a su hijo las Asistentes Educacionales. Favor de contestarlas lo mas sinceramente posible.)

1. Has the Educational Assistant made it easier for you to communicate with your child's teacher?

   YES ____ NO ____ DON'T KNOW ____

(1. Con la ayuda de la Asistente Educacional, se le ha hecho mas facil a Ud. comunicarse con la maestra de su hijo?)

   SI ____ NO ____ NO SE ____

2. Has the Educational Assistant made it easier for you to get involved with school activities?

   YES ____ NO ____ DON'T KNOW ____

(2. Con la ayuda de la Asistente Educacional, se le ha hecho mas facil a Ud. participar en las actividades de la escuela?)

   SI ____ NO ____ NO SE ____

3. Has the Educational Assistant helped you discuss with the teacher, the problems your child is having in school?

   YES ____ NO ____ DON'T KNOW ____

(3. Le ha ayudado la Asistente Educacional a discutir con la maestra los problemas que su hijo tiene en la escuela?)

   SI ____ NO ____ NO SE ____

APPENDIX E - continued

4. Has the Educational Assistant helped you discuss with the teacher what your child does in school?

YES ____ NO ____ DON'T KNOW ____

(4. Le ha ayudado la Asistente Educacional a discutir con la maestra lo que hace su hijo en la escuela?)

SI ____ NO ____ NO SE ____

APPENDIX F

READING INSTRUCTION OBSERVATIONAL SCHEME

The observations specified are to be made each minute for half an hour of reading instruction time. At the end of each minute check off the category of the activity in which the Educational Assistant is engaged.

The definitions below define the activities. If you are not sure of the category into which an activity falls use the chategory which seems closest to you.

DIRECT INSTRUCTION. Refers to the Educational Assistant conducting a lesson by himself, either by teaching an individual student or a group of students.

SUPPLEMENTARY INSTRUCTION. Refers to the Educational Assistant giving special assistance to individual students on the lesson the teacher is conducting. Includes such things as answering questions, special discipline, etc.

RECORD KEEPING AND MAINTENANCE. Refers to activity related to reading instruction but neither direct nor supplementary instruction, such as grading homework, preparing charts, etc.

OTHER MANAGERIAL. Refers to activity which helps the teacher but is not reading related, such as handling milk money, taking students to the principal, etc.

INACTIVITY.

MINUTE

OBSERVATIONAL CATEGORY	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30
Direct Instruction																														
Supplementary Instruction																														
Record Keeping and Maintenance																														
Other Managerial																														
Inactivity																														

DATE _____
SCHOOL _____
ED. ASSISTANT _____
TEACHER _____
OBSERVER _____